

Modern Language Notes

Volume LI

FEBRUARY, 1936

Number 2

HERMANN COLLITZ

1855-1935

The sudden death of Professor Hermann Collitz on May 13th took from our midst the Nestor of American philologists and one of the most distinguished students of linguistics we have ever had in America. His eminence as a scholar had already been recognized in Europe before he came to this country in 1886. It was therefore but natural that he should have been chosen as the first president of the Linguistic Society of America. Previous recognition of his contributions to linguistic science had been accorded him when in 1916 the University of Chicago conferred on him the honorary degree of L. H. D. He had also been president of the Modern Language Association of America; co-editor of *Modern Language Notes* 1902-1913; co-operating editor of the *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 1909-1929, and of the *American Journal of Philology* 1920-1929.

Born in the little town of Bleckede in Hanover, Germany, February 4, 1855, Collitz entered the University of Göttingen in 1875 where he devoted himself especially to the classical languages and Sanskrit, but with considerable attention also to Iranian, the Slavic and Germanic languages. Among his teachers here were Hermann Sauppe, Adalbert Bezzenberger and Theodor Benfey, and above all August Fick, to whom he owed his interest in comparative linguistics. In 1878 he went to Berlin to study with such famous scholars as Johannes Schmidt, Albr. Weber, Karl Müllenhoff, Wilhelm Scherer, H. Zimmer and V. Jagić. It was in Berlin that Collitz met Maurice Bloomfield, also a student at the university, with whom he was later to be associated at the Johns Hopkins University. A

detailed account of Professor Collitz' life and works will be found in the biographical sketch contributed by his wife, Dr. Klara Hechtenberg Collitz to the *Studies in Honor of Hermann Collitz*, Baltimore, 1930. Cf. also E. H. Sehrt: Address on the presentation of Professor Collitz' portrait to the J. H. U. in the *J. H. U. Alumni Magazine* (Nov. 1927, pp. 66-69).

Professor Collitz' works cover a wide range of interests as well as an extensive period in the field of linguistics, as is at once apparent by a mere glance at the appended bibliography. His earliest publications, particularly his article in *Bezzemberger's Beiträge* 2, 291-305 *Über die Annahme mehrerer grundsprachlicher a-Laute*, of which Wackernagel in his *Altindische Gramm.* page 5 says: "Schliesslich stellte Collitz BB 2, 303 ff. wissenschaftlich fest, was Benfey 1837 und Humperdinck 1874 (Collitz BB 11, 222 f.) nur gemutmasst hatten, dass der griech. Vokalismus den grundsprachlichen am genauesten wiedergebe" and his *Die Entstehung der indo-iranischen Palatalreihe*, BB 3, 177-234 connect him closely with the pioneer period of comparative linguistics. It is recalled that Friedrich Pott was one of the examiners when Collitz habilitated at the University of Halle in 1885 with his paper on *Die Flexion der Nomina mit dreifacher Stammabstufung im Altindischen und im Griechischen*, published in BB. 10, 1-71.

It is perhaps not without interest to note here that during the 1870's when a group of young men (Osthoff, Brugmann, Paul, Braune, Sievers), all connected with the University of Leipzig and at first facetiously called 'Junggrammatiker,' began to direct their shafts at the older linguists, it was none other than Sievers who tried to get Collitz to join them, but without success, partly because he considered many of the attacks against the older men as totally unjustified and partly because of school rivalry (cf. BB. 11, 203-242).

Altho Collitz' interest in the classical languages never ceased during his long life (witness his active participation in the publication *Griechische Dialektinschriften* begun in 1883 and finished in 1915) his attention was more and more directed to problems in comparative Germanics from the time of his appointment as Professor of German at Bryn Mawr College in 1886. His most notable contribution in this field is *Das schwache Präteritum und seine Vorgeschichte*, which contains also two important supple-

mentary chapters on the Latin Perfect and the Greek Passive Aorist. With this work he opened a new series of American publications in Germanic Philology entitled *Hesperia*. This series now contains eighteen numbers together with a supplementary series: *Studies in English Philology* with twelve numbers. In the Introduction to the first volume (*Das schwache Präteritum*) Collitz fights for recognition of the contributions of American scholars by their European colleagues. If for no other reason than this he deserves our everlasting gratitude, for the almost disdainful neglect of American learned journals in Europe was absolutely inexcusable as Collitz remarked: "Ein aufmerksamer Beobachter, denke ich, wird leicht finden, dass die amerikanische Wissenschaft sich längst nicht mehr auf Benutzung des Ertrages deutscher Geistesarbeit beschränkt, sondern beständig an wissenschaftlicher Selbständigkeit und Unabhängigkeit zugenommen hat und zunimmt."

Another important problem in Germanics to which Collitz devoted a great deal of attention was the Germanic vocalism. He took issue with the prevailing view that the Westgermanic and Norse languages (including the runic inscriptions) presented in many respects an older condition than Gothic. Collitz presents strong arguments for the priority of Gothic vocalism and his views seem to be making converts even tho but slowly.

Still another abiding interest was his beloved Low German. In 1903 appeared his *Waldeckisches Wörterbuch nebst Dialektproben*, which contains his well-known essay on the *Dialect of the Heliand*. Before this (1898), however, he had published as a *Sonderabdruck* of the first part of the Introduction to the *Waldeckisches Wörterbuch Die Niederdeutsche Mundart im Fürstentum Waldeck* and the *Home of the Heliand* (1902) in *PMLA*. He was also particularly fond of his *Vorlesungen und Übungen* in Low German which he gave periodically.

A mere reading of the titles in the bibliography of his publications at once reveals the fact that his *Arbeitsgebiet* par excellence was comparative linguistics, and in this the phonology and morphology of the Indo-European languages. He had always maintained that a proper understanding of the sounds and sound changes (*Lautgesetze*) in the various languages offered the only objective basis for real scientific study. He objected strenuously to the extensive use the 'Young Grammarians' made of analogy,

altho he fully recognized its existence as a linguistic phenomenon. Syntax took a decidedly secondary place in his philological investigations. He also never ventured on the thin ice of socalled *psychologische Sprachforschung*. In the later years problems in Indo-European mythology claimed a share of his attention. Cf. *Wodan, Hermes und Pūshan* (1924); *Antediluvian Kings and Patriarchs in the Light of Comparative Mythology* (1928); *König Yima und Saturn* (1930).

Altho a number of Collitz' published articles and longer works have not met with general acceptance it must be said to his credit that he rarely obstinately held to a point of view to the bitter end, unless he felt that the opposition had failed to destroy his argument or substituted a more plausible one. And it can furthermore be said that he was always ready to tackle the most difficult problems if they seemed vital to him. He never ventured to do so, however, until he was sure that he had fully qualified himself in advance. We frequently find in his earlier writings devastating polemics against scholars who had failed to acquire the essential preliminary and preparatory knowledge (cf. *BB.* 18, 239; *AnzfdA.* 5, 330). Another matter that Collitz did not mince words over is the reconstruction of phantastic Indo-European forms (cf. *MP.*, xv, 39 ff.).

A summary such as this would not be complete without a word in regard to Professor Collitz as a teacher. It was really a privilege and a pleasure for the mature and well-prepared student to attend his lectures and 'take his courses' on the Germanic languages. His Gothic course was anything but a translation course. It was an introduction to Indo-European Grammar as well as Germanic. It had two faces like the god Janus. A prerequisite was a knowledge of the classical languages as well as Sanskrit on the one hand, and at least one or two Germanic dialects on the other. Similarly his seminars in Old High German or Old Norse were not a mere interpretation of the text, but they presupposed a knowledge of Gothic. None of his courses were isolated, to be pigeon-holed and labeled as OHG, OS or ON, as seems to be a method very prevalent in many of our American universities. It goes without saying that the students who could profit by this kind of teaching were few and far between.

Professor Collitz was a kindly and gentle man of deep convictions, which he was always ready to defend vigorously. His comprehensive

knowledge and profound learning he was ever eager to share with students and colleagues. During his long life he had built up the best private library on comparative and Germanic linguistics in this country. It contains also many first editions of German writers and even several parchment MSS.

Professor Collitz' death leaves a void not only in the life of the writer, who knew him perhaps most intimately during an association of twenty-five years, but also in that of those who are most active in promoting linguistic work in the universities of the U. S. A.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PROFESSOR COLLITZ' WRITINGS¹

1878. Über die Annahme mehrerer grundsprachlicher *a*-Laute; *BB.* 2, 291-305.
 Register zu Bezzembergers Beiträgen zur Kunde der idg. Sprachen, Bd. 1-8 (1877-1884).
 Register zu W. Scherer, Zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache, 2. Ausgabe. Berlin 1878.

1879. Die Entstehung der indo-iranischen Palatalreihe; *BB.* 3, 177-234. (Pp. 177-201 also issued separately as a Göttingen dissertation.)

¹ In quoting current periodicals the following abbreviations have been used:

AnzfdA.	= Anzeiger für Deutsches Altertum und Deutsche Literatur.
AfslavPh.	= Archiv für Slavische Philologie.
AJP.	= American Journal of Philology.
APA.	= Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association.
BB.	= Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen, herausgegeben von A. Bezzemberger.
CP.	= Classical Philology.
DLZ.	= Deutsche Literatur-Zeitung.
IF.	= Indogermanische Forschungen.
JAOS.	= Journal of the American Oriental Society.
JEGP.	= Journal of English and Germanic Philology.
JHU. Circ.	= Johns Hopkins University Circular.
KZ.	= Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung (Kuhns Zeitschrift).
Lang.	= Language, Journal of the Linguistic Society of America.
MLN.	= Modern Language Notes.
MP.	= Modern Philology.
Ndd. Korr. bl.	= Korrespondenzblatt des Vereins für niederdeutsche Sprachforschung.
PBB.	= Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur (Paul u. Braunes Beiträge).
PMLA.	= Publications of the Modern Language Association.
Scand. Studies	= Scandinavian Studies and Notes.
ZfdPh.	= Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie (Zachers Zeitschrift).

Polnische Glossen aus dem 15./16. Jahrhundert; *AfslavPh.* 4, 86-97.

Etymologien. 1. Gr. Τέφρα, Lat. *favilla, febris*. 2. Gr. πῦgos, Lat. *frigus* = *srīgos; *BB.* 3, 321-323.

Skr. car-, cirá-m, Gr. τελέθω, πάλαι; *BB.* 5, 101-102.

Rev. of Brugmann-Osthoff, Morphologische Untersuchungen, vol. I; *AnzfdA.* 5, 318-348.

1880. Rev. of W. Thomsen, Der Ursprung des Russischen Staates; *AfslavPh.* 4, 656-663.

Rev. of G. Curtius: Das Verbum der griechischen Sprache, vol. II; *DLZ.* 1880, no. 13, col. 445-7.

1881. Rev. of Braune, Gotische Grammatik; *ZfdPh.* 12, 480-482.

Rev. of Brugmann-Osthoff, Morphologische Untersuchungen, vol. III; *DLZ.* 1881, no. 29, col. 1148-1150.

Rev. of von Bahder, Verbalabstracta; *DLZ.* 1881, col. 1264-1265.

1882. Rev. of Sievers, Phonetik, 2. Auflage; *DLZ.* 1882, nr. 6, col. 205-06.

Über eine besondere Art vedischer Composita; Abhandlungen des 5. Internationalen Orientalistenkongresses zu Berlin im September 1881. Vol. II, 2, 287-298.

Homerisch ḷú-s, éú-s und vedisch āyú-s; *KZ.* 27, 183-189.

Rev. of Ziemer, Junggrammatische Studien; *DLZ.* 1882, col. 1567-68.

Der germanische Ablaut in seinem Verhältnis zum indo-germanischen Vocalismus (I. Teil); *ZfdPh.* 15, 1-10.

Zur Einteilung der niederdeutschen Mundarten; *Ndd.Korr.-bl.* 7, 81-82.

1883. Rev. of Gust. Meyer, Griechische Grammatik; *BB.* 7, 173-176.

Rev. of Lanman, Noun-Inflection in the Veda; *BB.* 7, 176-184.

Sammlung der griechischen Dialektinschriften von J. Bau-nack, F. Bechtel, A. Bezzenger, F. Blaß, H. Collitz, W. Deecke, A. Fick, H. van Gelder, O. Hoffmann, R. Meister, P. Müllensiefen, W. Prellwitz. Herausgegeben von H. Collitz. 1. Heft, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
(I. Band, Heft 1-4, 1883-4.—II. Bd., Heft 1-6, 1885-99.—III. Bd., hrsg. von H. C. und F. Bechtel. 1. Hälfte, Heft 1-5, 1888-99, 2. Hälfte, Heft 1-5, 1898-1905.—IV. Bd., Wortregister und Nachträge. Heft 1, bearbeitet von R. Meister, 1886; Heft 2, hrsg. von H. C. und F. Bechtel, 1901; Heft 3 und 4, hrsg. von H. C. und O. Hoffmann, 1910-15.)

Rev. of Henry, Étude sur l'Analogie; *DLZ.* 1883, no. 39, col. 1357-58.

1884. Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften. Erster Band, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
 Kretisch ἀλλατᾶν — ἀλλάσσειν; *BB.* 8, 328-329.
 Rev. of Berghaus, Sprachschatz der Sassen. Vol. I, II; *DLZ.* 1884, col. 272-73.
 Rev. of Hoffory, Professor Sievers und die Sprachphysiologie; *ibid.*, col. 1613-14.

1885. Die Flexion der Nomina mit dreifacher Stammabstufung im Altindischen und im Griechischen. Teil I, Die Casus des Singulars; *BB.* 10, 1-71.
 (Accepted as "Habilitationsschrift" by the Philosophical Faculty of the University of Halle, March 1885.)
 Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse der griechischen Dialekte. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

1886. Die neueste Sprachforschung und die Erklärung des indogermanischen Ablautes; *BB.* 11, 203-242 (also publ. separately, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht) and (Nachtrag) 304-307.
 Über das vergleichende Studium der niederdeutschen Mundarten; *Ndd. Korr. bl.* 11, 23-32.
 Vorläufige Erklärung to 'Wahrung meines Rechtes'; *DLZ.* 1886, no. 51.

1887. Das *B* im Theraeischen Alphabet; *Hermes* 22, 136.
 Wahrung meines Rechtes; *BB.* 12, 243-248.
 Ἰφθιμος und ved. *kṣi*; *AJP.* VIII, 214-217. Reprinted in *BB.* 18, 226-230.

1888. Die Herkunft des schwachen Präteritums der german. Sprachen; *AJP.* IX, 42-57. (Reprinted in *BB.* 17, 227-244. Translated under the title "The Origin of the Weak Preterit"; *PMLA.* III, 196-209.)

1890. On the existence of Primitive Aryan *sh*; *JAOS.* 15, Proceedings, pp. lxv-lxvi.
 Review of Benfey's Kleinere Schriften, vol. I; *AJP.* XI, 488-495.

1891. Die Behandlung des ursprünglich auslautenden *ai* im Gotischen, Althochdeutschen und Altsächsischen; *BB.* 17, 1-53.
 Rev. of G. A. Hench, The Monsee Fragments; *MLN.* VI, col. 475-482.
 Rev. of Jellinek's Beiträge zur Erklärung der germanischen Flexion; *AnzfdA.* 17, 275-281.
 Über Ficks Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogerm. Sprachen; *AJP.* XII, 293-309.
 Rev. of Jackson "The Avestan Alphabet and its Transcription"; *ibid.*, XII, 489-492.

1892. Rev. of *Indogermanische Forschungen* (vol. I, no. 1); *Anzfda.* 18, 169-174.
 Die drei indischen Wurzeln *kṣi* und ihre Verwandten im Griechischen; *BB.* 18, 201-226.
 Zur Bildung des Instrumentals der *man*-Stämme im Alt-indischen; *ibid.* 18, 231-241.
 Rev. of Benfey's *Kleinere Schriften*, vol. II; *AJP.*, XIII, 484-492.

1893. Articles "Dutch Language," *Johnson's Cyclopædia*, Vol. II, 865-867 (1893), "Flemish Language," Vol. III, 415-416, and "Frisian Language and Literature," Vol. III, 600-602.
 Rev. of Paul's *Grundriß der germanischen Philologie* (vol. I, no. 1); *MLN.* VIII, col. 99-106 and 160-169.

1894. The Aryan Name of the Tongue; *Oriental Studies* (Papers read before the Oriental Club of Philadelphia, 1888/94.—Boston, Ginn & Co.), 177-201.
 Articles "Low German," *Johnson's Cyclopædia*, vol. V, 377-378 and "Plattdeutsch," vol. VI, 650-52 (1895).
 The Etymology of *āpa* and *μάψ*; *APA. Proceedings*, Special Session, 1894, xxxix-xl.

1895. Two Modern German Etymologies (1. *Schnörkel*, 2. *schmarotzen*); *PMLA.* X, 195-305.

1897. Der Name der Goten bei Griechen und Römern; *JEGP.* I, 220-238.
 Traces of Indo-European Accentuation in Latin; *APA.* 28, 92-110.

1898. Zu Goethes Faust. I. Eine mißverstandene Stelle im Vorspiel auf dem Theater; *Americana Germanica*, vol. II, No. 1, 87-91.

1899. Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften, 2. Bd. u. 3. Bd., 1. Hälfte (hrsg. v. H. Collitz und F. Bechtel). Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
 Die niederdeutsche Mundart im Fürstentum Waldeck (Sonderabdruck aus Bauers Waldeckischem Wörterbuche). Norden, D. Soltau.
 The Vedic word *návedas*. *JAOS.* 20, Pt. 2, 225-228.

1901. The Home of the Heliand; *PMLA.* XVI, 123-140.

1903. Waldeckisches Wörterbuch nebst Dialektproben, gesammelt von K. Bauer. Im Auftrage des Vereins für niederdeutsche Sprachforschung bearbeitet und herausgegeben von H. Collitz; pp. xvi + 106 + 320; Norden u. Leipzig, 1902; D. Soltau's Verlag.
 "German Language"; *New International Encyclopædia* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co.) in vol. 7 (first ed.).

1904. Zum Awesta-Alphabet; *Verhandlungen des XIII. Internationalen Orientalisten-Kongresses (1902)*, Leiden 1904, 107-108.

1905. Die Herkunft der *ā*-Deklination; *BB.* 29, 81-114.
 Inhaltsübersicht: I. Die *i*-Deklination im Rigveda 81; II. Die *i*-Deklination im Lateinischen 82; Exkurs: Zu den *iē*-Stämmen der latein. V. Deklination 83; III. Die *i*-Deklination in den übrigen europäischen Sprachen 85; IV. Parallelismus der *ā*- und der *i*-Deklination im Altindischen 89; V. Die *ā*- und *i*-Deklination im Altiranischen 96; VI. Zur Vorgeschichte der *i*-Deklination 98; VII. Ergebnisse für die *ā*-Deklination 104; VIII. Abgeleitete Stämme auf *-e-ya-* im Altindischen 109; IX. Die *ā*-Deklination in den europäischen Sprachen 110.

Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften, hrsg. von H. Collitz und F. Bechtel. III. Band, 2. Hälfte. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Das Analogiegesetz der westgermanischen Ablautsreihen; *MLN.* xx, 65-68.

Note on Francis Wood's article on German *dürfen*; *ibid.*, xx, 105.

Zum vokalischen Auslautgesetz der germanischen Sprachen; *ibid.* xx, 129-131.

1906. Problems in Comparative Germanic Philology; Congress of Arts and Science, Universal Exposition, St. Louis (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.), vol. 3 (Language, Literature, Art), 286-302.

1907. Segimer oder: Germanische Namen in keltischen Gewande; *JEGP.* 6, 253-306.
 Rev. of Gallée, Vorstudien zu einem altniederdeutschen Wörterbuche; *ibid.* 6, 472-477.

1909. Rev. of Fick, Vorgriechische Ortsnamen; *CP.* 4, 206-209.
 Rev. of Streitberg, Die gotische Bibel I.; *MLN.* xxiv, 181-183.

1910. Two Supplementary Notes: I. Old Norse *bedenn*. II. Gemination in Anglo-Saxon; *JEGP.* 9, 25-26.
 Zum Hildebrandsliede; *PBB.* 36, 366-373.
 Rev. of Fick, Hattiden und Danubier in Griechenland; *CP.* 5, 508-511.

1911. Rev. of Streitberg, Die gotische Bibel II.; *MLN.* xxvi, 182-184.
 "Missing"; Festschrift, Chr. Walther gewidmet von dem Verein für niederdeutsche Sprachforschung (= Jahrbuch des Vereins f. ndd. Sprf. XXXVII, Heft 1, 110-113).

1912. Das schwache Präteritum und seine Vorgeschichte (*Hesperia. Schriften zur germanischen Philologie* 1.); pp. xvi + 256;

Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press).

Rev. of Petzet & Glauning, Deutsche Schrifttafeln des IX. bis XVI. Jahrhunderts, 1. Abteilung; *MLN.* xxvii, 115-117.

1914. Rev. of *Hesperia* no. 1; *MLN.* xxix, 178-181.
Bemerkungen zum schwachen Präteritum; *IF.* 34, 209-222.

1915. Sammlung der griechischen Dialektinschriften, hrsg. von H. Collitz und O. Hoffmann. Vierter Band, IV. Heft, 1-3. Abteilung (Schluß der Sammlung). Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
Rev. of Sipma, Phonology and Grammar of Modern West Frisian; *MLN.* xxx, 215-217.

1916. Goethe's use of *vergakelt*; *MLN.* xxxi, 75-78.

1917. Rev. of Axel Kock, Brechung und Umlaut im Altschwedischen; *MLN.* xxxii, 40-44.
Zu den mittelhochdeutschen kurzen Präterita *gie*, *fie*, *lie*; *MLN.* xxxii, 207-215, 449-458.
The Etymology of the word *Degen*; *JHUCirc.* no. 296, 887.
The Greek noun *πρόμος*; *ibid.* 889.
Der Ablaut von Got. *speiwan*; *MP.* xv, 39-43.
Ags. *sedel*, Mod. German *siedeln*, Lat. *saeculum*; *ibid.* 900-902.

1918. Early Germanic Vocalism; *MLN.* xxxiii, 321-333.
The Etymology of Modern German *Ketzer*; *JHUCirc.* no. 306, 540-541.
Giselher; *ibid.* 558.
Low German *Ziegenfuß*; *ibid.* 563.
The Last Days of Ulfila; *ibid.* 566-569.

1919. Middle High German *alrune*; *MLN.* xxxiv, 52-53.
Rev. of Meillet's Caractères généraux des langues germaniques; *AJP.* xxxix, 409-418.
Rev. of Gaidoz's Deux Érudits gallois, John Rhys et L. Reynolds; *ibid.* 205-209.
The Systematization of Vowel-Sounds, or: Bell's Vowel-System modified and simplified; *JHUCirc.* no. 316, 588-589.
Rev. of Joh. Enschedé's Die hochdeutschen Schriften aus dem 15. bis zum 19. Jahrhundert; *MLN.* xxxiv, 492-496.

1920. The Causes of Phonetic Change; *JHUCirc.* no. 325, 664-665.
Anglo-Saxon *ræfnan*; *ibid.* 686-688.
Three Philological Anniversaries [of Bopp, Rask and J. Grimm]; *ibid.* 698.

1921. Old Icelandic *raun* and *reyna*; *Scand. Studies* 6, 58-67.
Saeculum; Festschrift für Ad. Bezzemberger, Göttingen, 1921, 8-13.

1922. Germanische Wortdeutungen 1. Gotisch *inn*, *inna*; *MLN.* XXXVII, 215-217.—2. Gotisch *duginnan* "beginnen"; *ibid.* 274-279.
Sunufatarungo; *JEGP.* 21, 557-571.

1924. Old Norse *elska* and the Notion of Love; *Scand. Studies* 8, 1-13.
Wodan, Hermes und Pūshan; Festschrift tillägnad Hugo Pipping 574-587. Helsingfors: *Skrifter utg. av Svenska Litteratursällskapet i Finland*, CLXXV.

1925. The Scope and Aims of Linguistic Science (abstract); *Lang.* I, 14-16.
Gothic siponeis, a Loan Word from Greek; *AJP.* XLVI, 213-221.
Gothic barusnjan; *ibid.* 358-362.
Das Wort Ketzer; Germania, Sievers-Festschrift zum 75. Geburtstage, 115-128.

1926. *Weg*, "Die Wand." Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Wortkunde; *The Germanic Review* I, 40-46.
 World Languages (Presidential address, Joint meeting of Modern Language Association and Linguistic Society of America); *PMLA.* XLI, xliii-lv; *Lang.* II, 1-13.
A Century of Grimm's Law; *Lang.* II, 174-183.
 An address delivered in 1923 on the occasion of the centenary of the 2nd edition of the first vol. of J. Grimm's Grammar. It includes a mnemonic device for remembering the working of the Law.

1927. In Memoriam [James W. Bright]; *Hesperia, Ergänzungreihe*, no. 10 (Preface).
 Rev. of K. Lokotsch, Etymologisches Wörterbuch der europäischen Wörter orientalischen Ursprungs; *MLN* XLII, 412-414.

1928. Das schwache Präteritum als Mischbildung; *PMLA.* XLIII, no. 3, 593-601.
 Antediluvian Kings and Patriarchs in the Light of Comparative Mythology; *JAOS.* 48 (1928), 341.
 (Syllabus of a Paper read at the Washington Meeting of the Amer. Oriental Society. Not yet published.)

1930. Rev. of Fritz Braun, Briefe von R. Rask an J. H. Halbertsma; *Lang.* VI, 195-201.
 Zwei Hapax Legomena der Gotischen Bibel; Curme Volume of Linguistic Studies (*Lang. Monographs*, VII, 60-83).

1931. The Avestan Prefix *as*; *JAOS.* 51, 160-163.

80 MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, FEBRUARY, 1936

1933. The Etymology of *augur*; *APA*. Proceedings 1933, lxiii.
1934. *Baltimore*—What does the Name Mean? *JHU. Alumni Magazine*, 22, 133-134.
König Yima und Saturn; Oriental Studies in Honour of Jal Dastur C. Pavry, Oxford, pp. 86-108.

Periodicals and Serial Publications

(Editor:) *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften*; 4 vols., Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1884-1915 (vol. 3 jointly with F. Bechtel, and vol. 4 with O. Hoffmann).
(Editor:) *Hesperia. Schriften zur germanischen Philologie*; nos. 1-18, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, and Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1912-1929.
(Co-Editor:) *Modern Language Notes*; vols. 17-28, Baltimore, 1902-1913.
(Co-operating Editor:) *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*; vols. 8-28, The University of Illinois, 1909-1929.
Vol. 28 was dedicated to Prof. Collitz.
(Co-operating Editor:) *American Journal of Philology*; vols. 41-50, Baltimore, 1920-1929.

EDWARD H. SEHRT

George Washington University

NOTKER'S ACCENTUATION OF THE PREPOSITIONS *AN, IN, MIT*

The purpose of the following discussion is a further exposition and in part correction of statements made on pages xiii-xiv of our edition of Notker's *Boethius* concerning the accentuation of the prepositions.

AN: From his examination of the occurrences of the preposition *an* in *Boethius* Fleischer¹ (p. 142) concluded that the rhetorical accent must have played some part in the accentuation. He was, however, unable to find any rule governing the omission. Carr² (p. 187) has shown that in the *Categories* and *De Interpretatione*, with but few exceptions, *an* is accented throughout. This agrees with our observations on the other Notker manuscripts. In *Boethius*³ we find 189 *án*, 115 *an*; in *Marcianus Capella* 132 *án*, 37 *an*; in the *Categories* 149 *án* in both MSS., 6 *án* in A (*Sangallensis* 825) against *an* in B (*Sangallensis* 818), 4 *án* in B against *an* in A. Twice the preposition is lacking in B where A reads *án*, and vice versa, A once (p. 464.2) lacks the preposition where B reads *án*. Only five times (376.26; 383.3; 397.12; 402.11; 411.17) have both MSS. *an*. We may fairly conclude that the parent MS. of A and B also lacked the accent at these places. *De Interpretatione* is carefully accented in the first three books, and in these *an* is found but five times (499.5; 503.7; 523.10; 531.14; 532.10), as against 26 *án*. In the last three books *an* far outnumbers *án* (65 to 14), but as accents are so frequently omitted in other words we need not attach any importance to this proportion. *De Syllogismis* has only *án* (17 times). As *De Musica* and the *Psalm*s have only a few cases of *án*, they can be disregarded. These totals, more than two to one for the accented preposition, in themselves indicate the probability that *an* was always accented. An analysis of the statistics confirms the supposition.

¹ O. Fleischer, *Das Akzentuationssystem Notkers in seinem Boethius*. *ZfdPh*, XIV, 128 ff., 285 ff.

² C. T. Carr, *Notker's Accentuation System in his Translations of Aristotle's 'Categories' and 'De Interpretatione.'* *MLR*, XXX, 184-203.

³ All references to Notker's *Boethius* and *Marcianus Capella* are to our editions in the *Altdeutsche Textbibliothek*, numbers 32-34, 37. References to the other works are to Piper's edition.

It is a striking fact that the *Boethius* shows the highest percentage of *an*. Either the scribe of the complete extant MS. or the scribes of earlier MSS. were careless, or they intentionally omitted the accent under certain circumstances. The distribution of *an* is a very unequal one, the middle portion showing a preponderance of *an*, whereas the beginning and the end have more *án*. By books the distribution is as follows: I 34 *án*, II *an*; II 53 *án*, 14 *an*; III 41 *án*, 37 *an*; IV 31 *án*, 37 *an*; V 30 *án*, 16 *an*. In *Marcianus Capella* three-fourths of the unaccented *an* are in that portion, less than half of the whole, written by the second scribe. The remarkable uniformity in the *Categories*, the first three books of *De Interpretatione* and *De Syllogismis* is likewise significant. To assume that Notker changed his usage, as Weinberg⁴ did in his analysis of the initial consonants, involves us in irreconcilable difficulties. Under such circumstances it would be impossible to explain the alternation between *án* and *an* in identical or similar phrases in immediate proximity, as: *Bo.* 117.1-2; 248.10 and 19; 351.23; 366.18 and 21; *Piper* 376.21 and 26; 397.7 and 12; 402.8 and 11, where in one case both MSS. read *án*, in the other A reads *án*, B *an*. That only scribal carelessness can account for all these instances, a brief examination of the phrases in which *an* occurs will at once show.

As the preposition *in* follows a definite rule in its position before the definite article, it is appropriate to begin at this point with *an*. Fleischer gave a partial, not very accurate analysis of the accentuation in *Bo.* and Carr has given figures for *Cat.* and *De Interpret.* The complete summary, corrected from the MSS., follows: In *Bo.* there are before the accented article 19 *án*, 26 *an*; before the unaccented article 105 *án*, no *an*. If the scribe intended to follow the rule of *in*, he made numerous errors. The instances of *án* before accented article occur twice on the same page or within the same line with *an* in the same position: *án* 40.16, 41.16; *an* 41.3, 41.16; *án* 138.21, *an* 138.19. The omission of the accent is, moreover, in the main restricted to the second half of the *Bo.* Up to page 196 there are only six instances of *an* before the accented article, as against 16 *án*; from that point to the end, 20 *an* and 3 *án*. In the *Cat.*, *De Interpret.* and *De Syll.* there is no trace of the rule for *in* as applied to *an*, the accent being omitted before

⁴ I. Weinberg, *Zu Notkers Anlautsgesetz*, Tübingen, 1911.

the article, accented or unaccented, only 402.11 and 503.7. In *MCp.* the only *an* before an article accented or unaccented, occur 20.3, 37.14, 140.12, 169.1, 179.10, five times as against 84 *án!* Before words other than the article there is, particularly in the *Bo.*, again a trend toward the use of *an* before an accented word. Before *ein*: *Bo.* 2 *án*, 2 *an*; *Cat.* 3 *án*; *MCp.* 2 *án*. Before an adjective: *Bo.* 12 *án*, 31 *an*; *Cat.* 18 *án*; *De Interpret.* I-III 10 *án*, 1 *an*; *De Syll.* 1 *án*; *MCp.* 13 *án*, 7 *an* (six of the latter in scribe β). Before a noun: *Bo.* 6 *án* (five in the first half), 20 *an*; *Cat.* 19 *án*, 2 *an*; *De Interpret.* I-III 1 *án*; *MCp.* 11 *án*, 7 *an* (six of the latter in scribe β). Before a pronoun: *Bo.* 46 *án*, 34 *an* (the majority of the latter in the second half); *Cat.* 59 *án*, 1 *an*; *De Interpret.* I-III 3 *án*, 3 *an*; *De Syll.* 2 *án*; *MCp.* 24 *án*, 16 *an* (14 of the latter in scribe β).

The combined evidence of the first half of *Bo.*, *Cat.*, *De Interpret.* I-III, *De Syll.* and the part of *MCp.* written by scribe α leaves no doubt that Notker's usage was to accent *án* throughout. Some of the later scribes tended to omit the accent not only before an accented article but before all accented words. This was notably the case with the scribe or scribes of the parent MS. of *Bo.* and the second scribe of the *MCp.* MS.

IN: In the above-mentioned article (p. 140 f.) Fleischer also established the rule that the preposition *in* retained the accent only before an unaccented word, in this case the unaccented article. He does not give complete figures, but after reexamining all the occurrences we have been able to confirm his conclusion. We found in approximately 570 cases only four where *in* was erroneously accented before an accented word: 114.30; 236.2; 296.21 (perhaps correct); 379.11. Of other apparent errors, 5.8 and 69.3 are misprints in Piper's text; in the latter case read *daz*; 100.12 *in* must be deleted (cf. Naumann,⁸ p. 74). The accent was erroneously omitted 69.14, 83.21 and twice in line 373.11. Carr (p. 187 f.) confirms the rule for the *Categories*. In *MCp.*, however, there are numerous exceptions, almost all of them instances of *in* wrongly provided with accent. Of the 296 cases of *in* only three should have the accent; 3.7 *in dien brûtechémanaton*; 172.6 *in dero innerostun*

⁸ H. Naumann, *Notkers Boethius, Untersuchungen über Quellen und Stil*, Strassburg, 1913.

mitti; 193.6 *in des lampadis uuîs*. At 33.13 *in dia bluotfâreuuun zéssa martis* the accent on the article was omitted, and at 39.2 we must read *in dien éimberînen*. On the other hand, in 88 cases of *in* 59 should not have been accented, e. g. 14.10, 17.10, 19.10, 16.8, 22.2, 76.7, 81.20, 87.9 etc. At 83.3.15 the MS. should read *in dero* instead of *in déro*. The first scribe has 56 errors, the second but 3. Apparently the second scribe followed quite closely the rule that *in* should appear only before an unaccented article, a rule which he was disposed to extend to the preposition *án*, whereas the first scribe seems to have applied the rule for *án* to *in*. Space does not permit listing the large number of instances in the *Psalms*. It is sufficient to state that while there are some instances of *in* before an accented word, by far the greatest number occurs before the unaccented article. In view of the frequent omission of accents in the *Psalms* the retention in these cases is important. There is therefore little occasion to doubt that the rule first formulated by Fleischer for the *Boethius* holds for all the MSS. and represents Notker's own usage.

MIT: Fleischer (p. 142) came to the conclusion that the preposition *mit* is left without accent in adverbial phrases (*mit réhte, mit nôte*) though otherwise accented throughout. Carr (p. 188) considers the evidence of the two MSS. of the *Categories* conclusive that *mit* was accented under all circumstances. The accentuation in the *Bo.* MS. does seem to support Fleischer's conclusion (cf. our Introduction to *Bo.*, p. xiv), but this evidence is in part of a doubtful character. The preposition appears without accent 17 times (38.29; 71.10; 71.11; 75.16; 105.16; 118.3; 134.31; 150.7; 154.1; 169.19; 199.19; 265.14; 268.4; 274.11; 370.25; 383.10; 396.18). In all the remaining 435 instances it has the accent, including the following cases of *mit réhte*: 180.24; 202.7; 245.28; 258.16; 335.1; 382.28; 393.12. Of the cases without accent, fourteen are in the phrase *mit réhte*, two in *mit nôte*, and one with the Latin noun *cestibus*. Clearly only the accentuation in the adverbial phrase requires explanation. It is significant that in the first half of *Bo.* the scribe writes regularly *mit réhte*. The first instance of *mit réhte* is 180.24. In the remainder of the MS. *mit* and *mít* are about equally divided. There may have been originally an accent at 199.19 as Piper thought, though it is not visible in the photostat. The section, pages 170 to 258, which shows no

instances of *mit* with the exception of the doubtful instance just mentioned, is distinguished by much greater care in accentuation and orthography than most of the rest of the *Bo.* MS. It is our opinion that the accentuation of *mit* in the adverbial phrases of this portion of the *Bo.* is of greater importance than the fact that *mit* in adverbial phrases outnumbers *mít* two to one in the entire MS. At all events, the evidence of the *Bo.* is not against the assumption that *mit* was accented throughout.

The *Categories*, as Carr points out, have overwhelmingly accented *mít*. There are 45 cases of *mít* and only 3 of *mit*. In adverbial phrases it occurs only ten times with accent in both MSS. (478.31 and 488.10 are found only in MS. B and with accent) viz.: 370.21; 379.6; 379.25; 383.8; 384.6; 397.8; 397.13; 429.10 (in B *mít* 'auf Rasur'); 439.28; 451.5. In the following cases only one of the two MSS. has *mit*: 370.21 A *mít réhte*, B *mit*; 397.25 A *mit êhte*, B *mít*; 423.22 A *mít uuíu*, B *mit*; 437.26 A *mit allo*, B *mit álo*. In *De Interpretione* and the following rhetorical works *mit* is frequently unaccented, the total figures being 42 *mít* against 32 *mit*. There are no cases of adverbial phrase. But this high frequency of the unaccented preposition is of no importance whatever, as the instances are to be found solely in the middle portion in a small section which is otherwise defective as to accentuation and orthography. From page 497 to 541 there are 19 *mít*, no *mit*; 542.20 to 607.22, 32 *mit* but no *mít*; 607.22 to 684, 11 *mít*, no *mit* (683.16 MSS. G and H have the unaccented form). In *Marcianus Capella* there are 216 cases of the preposition, of which only the following are without accent: 54.5; 128.12; 143.14; 154.1. Only one of the four is in the part written by the first scribe, who is more careful about placing accents than the second. In the phrase *mít réhte* the first scribe writes 4 *mít* and one *mit*, the second scribe, 2 *mit* and 3 *mit*. *De Musica* has only 2 *mít* in 17 instances of the preposition, and the *Psalm*s (St. Gall MS. R) have but 5 *mít* in approximately 750 occurrences. The fragments offer a few variants. The second Wallerstein fragment (U²) has *mit*, R *mit* at 644.8. The 'Seonerblatt' (U) shows the accented form in 28.24; 29.3; 29.16 against the unaccented in R; on the other hand, at 30.17 U *mit*, R *mít*. The 'Basler Blätter' at 577.21 offer *mít* against R *mit*. These few cases of the accented preposition tend to confirm the belief that, like the other works, the earlier MSS. of the *Psalm*s accented *mit* throughout.

On the evidence of *Bo.*, *Cat.*, *De Interpret.* and *MCp.* it is apparent that the omission of the accent on the preposition *mit* is the exception even in the adverbial phrases. *Bo.* alone has a preponderance of unaccented cases and these occur for the most part in those portions which are less carefully written also in other respects. There is consequently every reason to believe that *mit* always had the accent in Notker.

George Washington University
Harvard University

E. H. SEHRT
TAYLOR STARCK

“WHAT GOES THROUGH WATER AND IS NOT WET?”

The old riddle “What goes through water and is not wet” has various answers. From the beginning of its recorded history in the sixteenth century, three answers, *viz.* “the rays of the sun,”¹ “a shadow” or “smoke,”² and “a calf in its mother’s body,” are

¹ E. Flores, “Adivinanzas corrientes en Chile” *Revista del folklore chileno* II (Santiago de Chile, 1911), Parts 4 and 7 (with continuous pagination), p. 151, nos. 705-6; R. Lehmann-Nitsche *Adivinanzas rioplatenses* (Buenos Aires, 1911), p. 99, nos. 107 g-h; Demófilo (= A. Machado y Alvarez), *Colección de enigmas y adivinanzas* (Seville, 1880), 238, no. 847; F. Rodríguez Marín, *Cantos populares españoles* I (Seville, 1882), 188, no. 252; F. Pelay y Briz, *Endevinallas populares catalanas* (Barcelona, 1882), p. 93, no. 134; E. Rolland, *Devinettes ou énigmes populaires* (Paris, 1877), p. 2, no. 5; A. F. Butsch (ed.), *Strassburger Rätselbüchlein* (Strassburg, 1876), p. 18; R. Wossidlo, *Rätsel* (“Mecklenburgische Volksüberlieferungen” I; Wismar, 1897), p. 120, no. 372a; L. Hanika-Otto, *Sudetendeutsche Rätsel* (“Beiträge zur sudetendeutschen Volkskunde” XIX; Reichenberg, 1930), p. 50, no. 159a; E. L. Rochholz, *Alemannisches Kinderlied und Kinderspiel* (Leipzig, 1857), p. 244, no. 62; R. Huss, “Nordsiebenbürgische Rätsel” *Jahrbuch der Luxemburgischen Sprachgesellschaft* (1928), no. 121 (cited from Hanika-Otto, p. 146, note on no. 159); E. Ruoff, *Arabische Rätsel gesammelt, übersetzt und erläutert; ein Beitrag zur Volkskunde Palästinas* (Diss.; Tübingen, 1933), p. 13, no. 13. Compare Hanika-Otto, p. 65, no. 287. These works will be referred to henceforth by the author’s name.

² Lehmann-Nitsche, pp. 98-99, nos. 107 a-f; Rodríguez Marín, p. 313 (citing a Spanish text of the sixteenth century); G. Pitrè, *Indovinelli, dubbi, scioglilingua del popolo siciliano* (“Biblioteca delle tradizioni popolari siciliane” XX; Palermo, 1897), p. 160, no. 525; Hanika-Otto, p. 50, no. 159d (smoke); A. Karasek-Langer, “Volksrätsel aus den deutschen Sprachinseln in Galizien,” *Karpathenland*, II (1929), 182, no. 22 (smoke); A. Gorovei, *Cimiliturile românilor* (Bucharest, 1898), pp. 377-8, nos.

known, practically speaking, wherever the riddle is told. The answer "the sound of a bell,"³ which is not found before the end of the last century, is also rather widely current. Finally, two answers, *viz.* "a card" and "the eye," which appear only in an Argentinian collection of recent date, have a very limited currency and can be discarded without hesitation.⁴

The four established answers to the riddle fall into two classes—one concerned with the intangible and impalpable quality of the sun's rays, a shadow, or sound and another concerned with the altogether physical notion of a calf in its mother's body, an egg in a duck's belly, or the like. In the first three answers, it is hard to demonstrate the direction in which borrowing and substitution has occurred, since two of the answers are as old as any record of the riddle and the third has found a distribution almost as wide as the two old answers. In the French form of the riddle, *e. g.* "Qu'est-ce qui passe au-dessus de l'eau sans faire d'ombre?", the mention of the shadow in the question rather than as the answer suggests that it may have been shifted from answer to question. Possibly the same sort of shift may be seen in "¿Qué cosa es cosa—que entra en el rio—y no se moja;—no es sol ni luna—ni cosa ninguna?"⁵ Here the answer "shadow" may have replaced the original answer "the sun," which then found a place in the question. Such anticipations of the answer by introducing it into the question are frequent in oral variants of riddles. Further support of the idea that the "sun" is the original answer to the question may be seen in related riddles with the same answer of the sun and which show

1870-2; Ruoff, p. 12, no. 10. I have not found Pitré's reference (p. cxxv) to "Biblioteca de las tradiciones españolas" v, 231; but compare Rodríguez Marín, p. 313. I have not seen A. Machado y Alvarez, *Adivinanzas francesas y españolas* (Seville, 1881), p. 7, no. 5, which is also cited by Pitré.

³ L. F. Sauvé, "Devinettes bretonnes," *Revue celtique*, IV (1879), '63, no. 15; V. S. Mélusine, I (1878), col. 254, no. 3; Rolland, pp. 9-10, no. 21; J. F. Eladé, *Proverbes et devinettes . . . dans l'Armagnac et l'Agenais* (Paris, 1880), p. 215, no. 81.

⁴ These last two answers are neither widely known nor of long standing nor particularly appropriate to the riddle. The answer "a card," which is found in Lehmann-Nitsche, p. 98, nos. 105a, b, has arisen by contamination with another riddle (see *ibid.*, p. 254, no. 620a). The answer "the eye" is found only once (*ibid.*, p. 99, no. 108), and is presumably the result of some confusion.

⁵ Demófilo, no. 935.

similar confusions, *e. g.* "Es gêt durchs fenster und schneidt se net,"⁶ "Si fällt wås in brunn und plumpst nit,"⁷ which has the variant answers "a shadow" and, more rarely, "a feather," "Wos gäiht übas Strauh und rauscht niat?,"⁸ "Wos geht durch's Därne und sticht se net?,"⁹ which also has a variant answer "shadow," and the Czech riddles "Padne to do studně a deset páru koni to nevytáhne" (It falls in the well and ten pairs of horses do not pull it out),¹⁰ which vaguely suggests the Humpty-Dumpty riddle, and "Jelen moře přeskocí, ani nohy nesmočí" (A stag leaps over the sea and does not even wet its feet. *Ans.* The moon and the night).¹¹ All of these riddles are of the same type, and all of them are more closely associated with the sun than with any other answer. This intimate association suggests that the sun was the original answer. *Per contra*, the various questions popularly associated with the answer "a shadow" are of an entirely different sort. "The sound of a bell" is not, so far as I am aware, associated with any other question. Although "the sun" appears to me to be the original answer to the question, I shall not insist farther on the matter.

The last answer to our riddle appears in various forms which we need not distinguish sharply.¹² "A calf in its mother's belly" is the most widely distributed and the oldest of these variants and may therefore be the original form of this answer. "An egg in a

⁶ Wossidlo, p. 120, no. 372a; Hanika-Otto, p. 49, no. 151; Feifalik, *Zeitschrift für deutsche Mythologie*, iv (1859), 374, no. 40.

⁷ Wossidlo, p. 120, no. 372a; Hanika-Otto, p. 40, no. 84; Feifalik, pp. 374, no. 38 (sun), 381, no. 83 (shadow).

⁸ Hanika-Otto, p. 48, no. 148; A. Schleicher, *Litauische Märchen* (Weimar, 1857), p. 208 (shadow); F. W. Schuster, *Siebenbürgisch-sächsische Volkslieder* (Hermannstadt, 1865), p. 267, no. 22 (moonlight).

⁹ Hanika-Otto, p. 49, no. 152.

¹⁰ Feifalik, p. 374, no. 39.

¹¹ Hanika-Otto, p. 118, no. 1.

¹² Lehmann-Nitsche, p. 98, no. 106; Rolland, p. 25, no. 46 citing also a Hungarian variant in *Magazin für die Literatur des Auslands*, 1856, p. 364; Schuster, p. 279, no. 76; Renk, *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde* v (1895), 152, no. 176; Huss no. 106; Pittré, p. cxxv (citing a Spanish example from the sixteenth century); Sampson, *Journal of the Gypsy-Lore Society*, n. s., v (1911-2), 248, no. 10; Szendrey, *Ethnographia*, n. s., xvii (1921), 78; Hanika-Otto, p. 50, no. 159; A. C. Pires de Lima, *O Livro das Adivinhas* (Porto, 1921), p. 82, no. 245. W. Schulze points out the contamination of our riddle and the Odin-riddle; see "Das Rätsel vom trächtigen Tiere," *Ungarische Jahrbücher*, iv (1924), 23.

duck's belly" is found only occasionally and seems to be a sporadic variation. Finally, "Es gehen ihrer sieben durch den Bach und nur eins wird nass. *Ans. Zuchtsau mit sechs Jungen*"¹³ has been recognized to be a contamination of our riddle with the ancient Odin-riddle of the *Heidrekssaga*: "Who are the two, who have ten feet?" etc.

From the beginning of the history of our riddle, we find two answers, viz. "the sun" and a pregnant animal. Since both answers are appropriate, one might simply stop at this point without seeking a reason for the existence of two such dissimilar answers to the same question. Riddles with more than one answer are frequent enough, but there is, however, a possible explanation for this particular combination of answers. Just such metaphors as we find in this riddle were used in the Middle Ages to explain the miracle of the Virgin Mary's purity. As the sun passes through glass without breaking it, so Mary became a mother and yet remained a virgin.¹⁴ The comparison is at least as old as Athanasius in the fourth century and has been widely used ever since. Possibly one may also cite as a parallel the comparison of the painless birth of Jesus to the light leaving a star,¹⁵ but this is neither so ancient nor so apposite as the previous comparison. The ease with which the substitution of the shadow for the sun is made is seen in the use which Hans Folz made of this comparison:

Man sagt: gleich als der schattenn
Die wasser thu durch watten
Und sich nit necz
Und als der sunnen scheine
Dring durch die fenster eine
Und sie nit lecz,
Also Got sun den milden
Du, meit, geper, die zwo natur,
Als man gedicht vil vindet.¹⁶

¹³ Hanika-Otto, p. 50, no. 159 and see the preceding note.

¹⁴ A. Salzer, *Die Sinnbilder und Beiworte Mariens in der deutschen Literatur und lateinischen Hymnenpoesie des Mittelalters II* (Linz, 1887), 71-74; W. Grimm (ed.), *Konrads von Würzburg Goldene Schmiede* (Berlin, 1840), p. xxxi. Yrjö Hirn collects and discusses examples dating from the ninth century and later; see "La verrière symbolique de la maternité virginal," *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, XXIX (1928), 33-39.

¹⁵ Salzer, II, 78.

¹⁶ A. L. Mayer (ed.) *Die Meisterlieder des Hans Folz* ("Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters" XII; Berlin, 1908), 151, no. XXXIV, § 6, ll. 370-8.

To return, then, to our riddle—it seems probable that the patristic comparison of Mary's virginity to the water or glass through which the rays of the sun pass unaltered is allied to the traditional riddle: "What passes through water without being wet? *Ans.* The rays of the sun or a calf in its mother's belly." The riddle, which might seem to be only a countryman's observation of nature, is entangled with an ecclesiastical invention current among the Church Fathers. Of such strange threads are the fabrics of ecclesiastical and popular tradition woven!

ARCHER TAYLOR

The University of Chicago

RAINER MARIA RILKE'S POEM ON HEINRICH VON
KLEIST

Strangely enough, Rainer Maria Rilke's poem on Heinrich von Kleist has not been included in the six-volume edition of his collected works.¹ Fortunately, however, it has been preserved and included in the notes appended to a volume of his letters.² Had he not referred to this early poem in one of these letters, it might have escaped publication even in this hiding-place where it will probably be seen by relatively few readers. It deserves a place with the numerous other poems on Kleist, fifty-three of which were collected and published in 1927 by Georg Minde-Pouet³ before Rilke's poem had become accessible.

Rilke's *Gedicht an Kleist* was written on January 14, 1898, at the grave of Kleist at Wannsee to which he made repeated visits. In a letter of November 5, 1900, he wrote to Paula Becker that up to his sixteenth or seventeenth year of age he had regularly visited churchyards on All Souls' Day, often going to the graves of strangers or of relatives with the thought that every hour is the hour of death, and that death has a dial with infinitely many numbers. But in more recent years the only grave he had been in

¹ Rainer Maria Rilke, *Gesammelte Werke*, Leipzig, Insel-Verlag, 1930.

² Rainer Maria Rilke, *Briefe aus den Jahren 1907 bis 1914*, Leipzig, Insel-Verlag, 1933, p. 382 f.

³ *Gedichte auf Heinrich von Kleist. Eine Auswahl.* Als Privatdruck zusammengestellt von Georg Minde-Pouet, Leipzig, Poeschel & Trepte, 1927.

the habit of visiting on All Souls' Day was that of Kleist at Wannsee. He added the following melancholy but appreciative comment:

Spät im November ist er da draussen gestorben; in einer Zeit, wo viele Schüsse fallen im leeren Walde, fielen auch die zwei schweren Schüsse aus seiner Waffe. Sie unterschieden sich kaum von den andern, vielleicht dass sie etwas heftiger waren, kürzer, atemloser . . . Aber in der lastenden Luft werden die Geräusche alle ähnlich und stumpfen sich ab an den vielen weichen Blättern, die überall im Sinken sind.⁴

Rilke's friend Fürstin Marie von Thurn und Taxis-Hohenlohe wrote that in the winter of 1913-1914 he was reading Kleist, reading many of his works for the first time; mature as he was, they affected him all the more powerfully, because there were no earlier impressions of them to combat.⁵ In a letter to her of December 27, 1913, Rilke voiced enthusiastic admiration for the Prussian poet:

Der Kleist war schön, sag ich Ihnen, ach wenn ichs Ihnen doch sagen könnte; da ist unsreiner nichts dagegen, so ein Piepvogel, . . . aber einmal müssen Sie, ganz neu und nüchtern, über den Prinzen von Homburg kommen, über das Guiskard-Fragment . . . Wunderschön ist das alles und so blind und rein gekonnt, so aus den Tiefen einer harten Natur herausgebrochen . . .

Ich ging als junger Mensch immer gern an sein Grab, damals wars noch eine Wildnis herum, obwohl die Bahn nahe vorübergeht, ein Kranz von der Sorma war dort, aber das Gitter rostete in Vergessenheit, der Ruhm hatte nicht nötig, sich darauf zu stützen, der stand frei. Zu jener Zeit schrieb ich (noch weiss ichs oder weiss es wieder) in mein Taschenbuch:

‘Wir sind keiner klarer oder blinder,
wir sind alle Suchende, du weisst,—
und so wurdest du vielleicht der Finder,
ungeduldiger und dunkler Kleist . . .’

Gott, ich kannte wenig von ihm und meinte seinen Tod, den seltsamen, weil ich nur das Seltsame verstand, jetzt aber meine ich sein Leben, weil ich langsam anfange, vom Schönen einen Begriff zu haben und vom Grossen, so dass mich der Tod bald nichts mehr angeht.⁶

The three other stanzas of the poem, as printed in its entirety in the notes, read:

⁴ Rainer Maria Rilke, *Briefe und Tagebücher aus der Frühzeit 1899 bis 1902*, Leipzig, Insel-Verlag, 1931, p. 68 f.

⁵ Marie von Thurn und Taxis-Hohenlohe, *Erinnerungen an Rainer Maria Rilke*, München, Oldenbourg, 1933, p. 74.

⁶ Rainer Maria Rilke, *Briefe aus den Jahren 1907 bis 1914*, p. 313 f.

Eng und ängstlich waren dir die Tage,
bis dein Weh den letzten wild zerriss—
und wir alle klagten deine Klage
und wir fühlten deine Finsternis.

Und wir standen oft an tiefen Teichen,
denen schon das Nachten nahe war,
und wir nahmen Abschied von den Eichen,
und wir kamen unsren Bräuten reichen
letzte Rosen aus dem letzten Jahr.

Aber zagend an dem Rand der Zeit
lernten wir die leisen Laute lieben,
und wir sind im Leben lauschen blieben
still und tief und wund von jungen Trieben—
und da wurden uns die Wurzeln breit.⁷

In a letter of December 30, 1913, there is a further reference to Kleist. After writing that he had been reading at random, Rilke continued:

C'est de cette façon que je viens de connaître l'œuvre d'un très grand poète allemand, Kleist, (qui s'est suicidé en 1811) ah—quelles beautés partout, quelles victoires; qui serait assez avare de croire de les payer trop cher de toute détresse qui échoit sur son compte, si à la fin les pages de l'avoir surabondent tellement qu'il serait impossible à jamais d'indiquer la somme de toute cette fortune.⁸

Rilke, the sensitive esthete, who was quite dependent on the mood of the moment for his own poetic productivity, was impressed not only by the virility of Kleist's style and character, but doubtless also with the fecundity of an author who within a decade wrote eight dramas, eight *Novellen*, numerous political and miscellaneous minor writings, collaborated with Adam Müller in editing the journal *Phöbus* and published the *Berliner Abendblätter*, Berlin's first daily evening newspaper. Rilke's poem and appreciative letters constitute one of the sincerest tributes paid to Heinrich von Kleist by another poet.

JOHN C. BLANKENAGEL

Wesleyan University

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 382 f.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 323.

KLEIST'S PRINZ FRIEDRICH VON HOMBURG,
LINES 172-174

Prinz Friedrich's words describing Natalie's action:

Hoch auf, gleich einem Genius des Ruhms,
Hebt sie den Kranz, an dem die Kette schwankte,
Als ob sie einen Helden krönen wollte,

seem, in view of their context and the stage-business involved, startlingly hyperbolic. Natalie had simply held out a laurel wreath as though to place it on the Prince's head; he himself has just spoken of her action moderately enough (163), and he is replying to Hohenzollern's matter-of-fact question: "Nun, und die, sagst du, reichte dir den Kranz?" (171).

The Prince's high-flown words do, however, apply strikingly to a painting, now No. 306 of the Gemäldegalerie in Dresden, which Kleist may very well have seen during his several visits (1800, 1801, 1803, 1807-1809) to the Saxon capital. It is the work of Annibale Carracci (1560-1609); it represents a winged youth (incidentally of Kleist's favorite type, "blondgelockt" like the Prince himself) in flight, a blaze of golden light about his laurel-crowned head; in his left hand, *raised full above his head*, is a crown, to which his aspiring gaze is directed; on his upraised arm are four laurel wreaths of victory, such as were customary at the Greek games. The whole conception is thoroughly in Kleist's ambitious spirit.¹

This painting, according to the records of the Dresden gallery, was acquired in 1746 and was hanging, during Kleist's lifetime, in the same collection (then housed in the Johanneum) with Raphael's Sistine Madonna, which we know Kleist profoundly admired and often visited.

His first acquaintance with the gallery, during his rationalistic period, was, to be sure, a matter of superficial sight-seeing (v, 103, 7-10); but less than a year later, in a deeply stirred and highly emotional state of mind, he has become extremely sensitive to artistic impressions (v, 222, 1 ff.). Daily, he reports, he visits

¹ The conceptions of a winged spirit and of coronation come to be favorites with Kleist: cf. e. g. in the present play lines 902 f., 1062 f., 1833 ff.; *Werke*, Bibliograph. Inst. ed. (hereafter cited by vol. and p.), II, 267, 23-24 (very like Carracci's youth); v, 342, 25 ff.; v, 356, 16 ff.

"the Italian masterpieces," chief among which is Raphael's Madonna (v, 222, 9 ff.). The fact that the latter at that time was together with all the other Italians (not in a separate room as at present) increases the probability that Kleist saw Carracci's picture also. The entire collection was much less extensive than it is now, and Carracci's painting, because of its size (over 6 by 4 feet) and its character, would hardly have escaped his notice. Originally entitled "l'onore" or "il valore," it bore, at least as early as 1771, the German words "Genius des Ruhms" (cf. 172), words which for Kleist were pregnant with meaning, and which do not, as far as I know, represent a common conception.

As subsequent passages in Kleist's letters prove (e. g. v, 232, 20-24; 235, 20), the artistic impressions of that Dresden stay, suffused as they were with intense private emotion, persisted for a long time. It would be strange, too, if Kleist, during his long sojourn in Dresden from 1807 to 1809, when *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* was taking shape in his mind, had not revisited the paintings which had once affected him so deeply.

At any rate, it seems to me more likely that the unusually vivid and heroic picture of lines 172-174 is the result of a pictorial impression² than that, as Erich Schmidt suggested,³ these lines are a reminiscence of Goethe's *Egmont*.

WALTER SILZ

Harvard University

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE ORIGINAL OF GOETHE'S "HOCHLÄNDISCH"

In 1828 Goethe published in *Über Kunst und Alterthum* (Band vi. Heft 2; now Weimar Edition, iv, 335) three stanzas with the above title and beginning: "Matt und beschwerlich," the author-

² For the marked effect of pictorial impressions on Kleist, cf. v, 342, 20 ff., the origin of *Der zerbrochene Krug*, and probably of *Homburg* itself (Kretschmer's painting, cf. III, 9, 35 ff.). The beautiful figure of lines 1833 ff. in *Homburg* may also be a reflection of Carracci's painting. Kleist's two letters to Adolphine von Werdeck, recently published as a "Privatdruck" for the Kleist-Gesellschaft, bring new proof of Kleist's lively interest, indeed absorption, in paintings, especially those representing individual persons.

³ III, 430; Klärchen, incidentally, appears as "Freiheit," not as "Viktoria."

ship of the original of which seems to be still unknown to Goethe scholars. Goethe sent these verses with his letter of July 20, 1827 to Carlyle, who may well have been puzzled by them, though it has sometimes been suggested that he probably supplied Goethe with the original! When the Correspondence between Goethe and Carlyle was finally published in 1887, these verses were accompanied by an English version made (or approved) by the editor, C. E. Norton, and beginning: "Faintly and heavily," but with no explanatory note. More than twenty-five years ago Carlyle's nephew the late (Sir) Alexander Carlyle even wrote me that he felt sure that these verses were in fact not translated by Goethe but really written by him without any original, either Scottish or English. Dünzter and others have looked vainly for an original, especially in books containing the well known Scottish Ballad "Get up and Bar the Door" (Child's No. 275), of which Goethe's version was enclosed in the same letter to Carlyle (both were also sent to Zelter in June and July 1827). I, too, made and had made in the British Museum and elsewhere a very extensive similar search, but in vain.

However (as noted in the Weimar Edition, Vol. v, part 2) the "Festgabe zur Enthüllung des Wiener Goethedenkmals," Vienna 1900 (forming No. 9 of Vol. xiv of the *Chronik des Wiener Goethe-Vereins*) included as a *Beilage* an admirable facsimile of an autograph manuscript dated June 1827, in the possession of the Duke of Cumberland, in Gmunden, having been presented to his grandmother Queen Friederike of Hannover by Eckermann after Goethe's death. This manuscript, headed at first "Altschottisch" partly erased and replaced by "Hochländisch," is written very clearly in ink on a single large page with a light vertical line down the middle, the English original written as three stanzas of eight lines each being on the left, and Goethe's version opposite them on the right. On pasted-down slips Goethe has substituted "Felsen ersteigt er" for "Kühnlicher steigt er" (line 4) and "Hat er mühselig | Also den Tag vollbracht" for "So melancholisch | Hat er den Tag verbracht" (lines 9-10), as recorded in the Weimar *Lesarten*. Though the variants of this manuscript of the German version have thus been duly recorded, the original which accompanied it seems never to have been reprinted. There is nothing here to indicate its authorship or source in any way, or even to supply the slightest clue which might be followed up. Goethe wrote the original thus:

Faint and wearily	Tho so melancholy	Eating, quaffing
The way worn traveller	The Day is past by,	At past labor laughing
Plods uncheerly	It would be folly	Better by half in
Afraid to stop.	Now to think on it more,	Spirit than before
Wandring drearily	Blith and jolly	O how merry then the
And sad unraveller	He that can hold fast by	Rested traveller
Of the mazes t'wards	As he's sitting	Seems while sitting
The mountains top.	At the Goatherd door.	At the goatherds door.

A mere lucky chance finally enabled me to settle the question of authorship. In 1910 I picked up in an old book shop in Glasgow two promising-looking little volumes, one of which, entitled *The English Musical Repository: a choice selection of entertaining English Songs, adapted for the Voice, Violin, and German Flute* (London: B. Crosby & Co., 1807) has the song "Faint and wearily the way-worn traveller" listed in the Contents, and printed on page 222, with simple music, to be sung by "Agnes" and "Sadi," but without any indication of authorship of either words or music. The other little old volume contains a number of miscellaneous items bound up in no particular order; in the middle is the *pièce de resistance*, namely: *The Whim of the Day, for 1794. Containing An Entertaining Selection of the Choicest and most Approved Songs, now singing at the Theatres Royal, the Anacreontic Society, the Beef Steak Club, and other Convivial and Polite Assemblies, To which is added the Sentimental . . .* [title-page cut here]. London. Printed by and for J. Roach, Russel Court Drury Lane, 1794. Price One Shilling, in which our verses appear on pages 30-31 as sung in Duet by Mr. Bannister, jun. and Mrs. Bland, among "Songs, Duets, Chorusses, &c. sung in the Play of the MOUNTAINEERS . . . with Universal Applause." Again no author is named, but every school boy ought to know that the title-page of the first authorized edition reads: *The Mountaineers; A Play, in three acts; written by George Colman; (the Younger) and first performed at the Theatre Royal, Haymarket, On Saturday, August 3, 1793. London: Printed for J. Debrett . . . 1795.* I have examined also in the British Museum an earlier pirated and inaccurate edition with title reading: *Printed for the curious and not sold by the Booksellers in general. 1794.*, and without Colman's name. In the authorized edition our verses are sung as a Duet by Sadi and Agnes in Act III Scene II: "The Outside of a Goatherd's cottage. Sadi and Agnes discovered before the door at a table, eating and drinking." This

Duet is here printed as two stanzas of ten lines each, the fifth to eighth of each being much shorter than the others, and accordingly placed much farther towards the right of the page. Goethe's translation and transcript omit entirely the last six lines of the first stanza, and he transcribed and translated the second stanza of ten lines as if it were two stanzas of eight short lines each. I still have no idea from what book or other publication he made his transcript—evidently not from any of the four known to me. At least we now know by whom his original was originally written—unless indeed Colman himself used words written by someone else, known or unknown, which seems at least very improbable. Where Goethe wrote: "He that can hold fast by" the 1793 edition reads: "he the kag holds fast by"; the 1794 edition has: "he the keg holds fast by"; the 1794 *Whim of the Day* reads: "he the cag holds fast by"; and the 1807 *English Musical Repository* has: "he the cann holds fast by."

LEONARD L. MACKALL

Savannah, Ga.

AN AHNFRAU SCENE IN SCHILLER'S WALLENSTEIN

Fashions in literature change about as rapidly as they do in clothes and when such a fashion is outmoded it may appear as ridiculous as a 1925 knee-length evening dress at a formal reception in 1935. Especially is this the case if the fashion in question has become the object of a particularly telling satire.

Grillparzer considered it a great calamity in his life that Gervinus (1842) and other literary historians because of one drama, in fact his first, *Die Ahnfrau*, 1817, counted him as belonging in the same class with Werner, Müllner, and other *Schicksalsdichter*, whereas according to one of his epigrams his position was "wo Schiller und Goethe stand." The satire which Platen (*Die verhängnisvolle Gabel*, 1826) and others had heaped on the *Schicksalsdramen* made the *genre* appear no longer respectable; yet no one ever placed Schiller in the same category even if much in his works was singled out as smacking of fate tragedies.

There is a passage in *Wallenstein* in basic conception of thought similar to *Die Ahnfrau*, which so far as I know has never been

pointed out in any study on Schiller and Grillparzer. It is contained in Thekla's monolog in *Die Piccolomini*, Act III, Scene 9:

Es geht ein finstrer Geist durch unser Haus,
Und schleunig will das Schicksal mit uns enden.
Aus stiller Freistatt treibt es mich heraus,
Ein holder Zauber muss die Seele blenden.
Es lockt mich durch die himmlische Gestalt,
Ich seh' sie nah und seh' sie näher schweben,
Es zieht mich fort mit göttlicher Gewalt,
Dem Abgrund zu, ich kann nicht widerstreben.

(Man hört von ferne die Tafelmusik.)

O! wenn ein Haus im Feuer soll vergehn,
Dann treibt der Himmel sein Gewölk zusammen,
Es schiesst der Blitz herab aus heitern Höhn,
Aus unterird'schen Schlünden fahren Flammen,
Blindwütend schleudert selbst der Gott der Freude
Den Pechkranz in das brennende Gebäude!

My attention was called to this passage through an illustration by Johann Heinrich Ramberg in *Minerva für das Jahr 1811* (reproduced in *Friedrich Schiller*, Otto Guentter, Leipzig, 1925) in which Thekla is represented as speaking these lines in the vaulted room of a castle while in the background there appears a ghostly figure with a drawn dagger. The artist Ramberg did not attempt to portray events as they were shown on the stage—for example, in another illustration he pictures Max's death on the battlefield—but he used his imagination freely. The very fact that to a contemporary Schiller seemed to be making use in his *Wallenstein* of a figure resembling the *Ahnfrau* shows that to the readers of that day the greatest German dramatist belonged among the writers who portrayed avenging ghosts as the Nemesis of noble houses. If Ramberg had made his illustration a few decades later he would probably have refrained from picturing the ghostly figure “mit dem verhängnisvollen Requisit.” But as it was, Werner's *Der vierundzwanzigste Februar* had just had its première under Goethe's direction in Weimar, February 24, 1810.

A. E. ZUCKER

The University of North Carolina

IBSEN—HETTNER—*CORIOLANUS*—BRAND

While Ibsen was engaged on *Brand* (at the time still planned as an epic poem) he wrote to Björnson from Rome, January 28, 1865:¹

The beauty of the antique sculpture becomes more and more evident to me, as you predicted in your letter that it would. The perception of it comes in flashes, but such an occasional flash casts its light over vast areas. Do you remember "The Tragic Muse," which stands in the room outside of the rotunda in the Vatican? No statue that I have yet seen in Italy has taught me so much as this. I verily believe that it has revealed to me what Greek tragedy was. That indescribably great, noble, calm joy in the expression of the face, that richly wreathed head which has something supernaturally exuberant and bacchantic about it, those eyes, that look inward and yet through and far beyond the outward object they are fixed on,—such was Greek tragedy. The statue of Demosthenes in the Lateran, the faun in the Villa Borghese, and the faun (Praxiteles') in the Vatican (Braccio Nuovo), have also given me a deep insight into Greek life and character, and have, moreover, helped me to understand what the imperishable element in beauty really is. Would that I could bring this understanding to bear upon my own work.

Where did Ibsen get his theoretical ideas of tragedy and beauty? If a symbolical statue like the Muse of Tragedy is to mean anything to the observer he must bring to it some abstract notions. Which critic had taught Ibsen what the "imperishable elements of beauty" were? Whose ideas did he want to bring to bear on his own work? The answer is found in Henrik Jaeger's biography of Ibsen for which he himself had furnished the data to the author. We read in this connection:²

He did not concern himself greatly with dramaturgical studies of a theoretical description. He read Heiberg's prose writings, especially the noted essay on the vaudeville, and he got hold, while on his travels, of Hermann Hettner's *The Modern Drama*, which had just appeared, and which he found to be a very interesting and stimulating book. This was about the whole of his theoretical reading. (Jaeger here refers to the summer of 1852.)

(Speaking of *Lady Inger of Oestraat*): The work shows that his theatri-

¹ *Letters of Henrik Ibsen*, translated by John Nilsen Laurvik and Mary Morison, New York, Fox, Duffield and Company, p. 82.

² *Henrik Ibsen. A Critical Biography* by Henrik Jaeger. From the Norwegian by William Morton Payne, Second Edition, Chicago, A. C. McClurg and Co., 1901, pp. 83 and 89.

cal occupations had enabled him to profit by some of the principles developed by Hermann Hettner in his little book. Hettner had condemned with great force the loose sort of chronicle play that had been called forth by admiration of Shakespeare's "histories" and had emphasized the necessity for employing strict rules of composition, and for making the historical drama a "psychological tragedy of character," if it were to pass for a work of genuine art. (*Lady Inger* was published in 1855.)

On the same subject we read in Koht,³

While Ibsen was in Dresden nothing else held his interest as did this declaration of a program by Hettner. He read and studied it, and later it seemed to him that he had been in the city for four months, though in reality it was less than two, so rich was the summer to him because of this one book, in whose strong idealistic demands he recognized his own spirit.

At the same time, November 27, 1855, Ibsen gave a lecture before a Bergen literary society, on Shakespeare.⁴

Even more than most authors, Ibsen was loath to acknowledge the influence of others on his work, and therefore the fact that he admits his indebtedness to a critic is highly significant. Hettner discusses Greek drama in passing, and stresses the fact that Shakespeare was second only to the Greeks as a master of tragedy. In discussing Shakespeare's English historical plays, Hettner characterizes them in a manner that might be termed "exuberant and bacchantic":⁵ "Diese wilden Männer mit ihrem hartherzigen Trotze und ihrer löwenartigen Tapferkeit, und diese furchtbaren Weiber, diese grausen Erinnyen, in deren Herzen nicht der Gott der Liebe wohnt, sondern der Gott des Hasses und des Fluches." Of all Shakespearean plays discussed in the book by far the most space is devoted to *Coriolanus*—seven pages as against three for *Julius Caesar* and much less for others. Otherwise generally a very sharp critic, Hettner speaks of this play in superlative terms:⁶

Und wie wir den Lear, den Macbeth, den Othello und alle diese grössten Werke unseres Dichters Charaktertragödien nennen, insofern sich die Schürzung und Lösung des Knotens, bis auf die feinsten Motive, mit

³ Halvdan Koht, *The Life of Ibsen*, New York, W. W. Norton and Co., 1931, I, 80.

⁴ Koht, *op. cit.*, I, 117.

⁵ Hermann Hettner, *Das moderne Drama*, hrsg. v. P. A. Merbach, Deutsche Literaturdenkmale des 18. u. 19. Jhdts., B. Behrs Verlag, Berlin u. Leipzig, 1924, p. 17.

⁶ Hettner, *op. cit.*, pp. 31, 27.

innerster Notwendigkeit aus dem Charakter des Helden herausspinnt, so glaube ich jenes Wort, das ich schon oben aussprach, jetzt mit allem Recht noch einmal wiederholen zu dürfen, dieser Coriolan ist trotz seines historischen Stoffes, durch und durch eine psychologische Charaktertragödie, ja er ist sogar ein unerreichbares Muster derselben.

Der dritte Akt, der den tatsächlichen Zusammenstoss darstellt, ist vielleicht das Grösste, das Shakespeare gedichtet hat.

The letter to Björnson of January 28, 1865, shows plainly that Ibsen is not quite satisfied with the plan for the work which occupies him, and that he is not writing much, but rather thinking strenuously on the proper form into which to cast his *Brand*. In fact he says in the paragraph following the one quoted above: "I often lie for half a day among the tombs of the Via Latina or the old Appian Way; and I do not think this idling can be called waste of time." The work occupying him at the moment was a sermon to the Norwegian nation which was to embody his wrath over their cowardice in the Danish-Prussian War of 1864; he was putting it into the form of an epic poem for which Welhaven's *Norges Daemring* and Paludan-Müller's *Adam Homo* were in a general way the models. But the episodic quality of such a narrative poem did not satisfy Ibsen; as his letter shows, he wished that he might be able to lend his work the greatness of genuine tragedy.

In his next letter to Björnson, written from Ariccia, September 12, 1865, he tells of his success in discovering the proper form for *Brand* and of the effect this had on the manner in which he worked at it:⁷

Things are going well with me now; and they have really been doing so the whole time, except on the one or two occasions when I have been at my wit's end, not only where to turn to for money, but with regard to my work also. It would make no progress. Then one day I strolled into St. Peter's —I had gone to Rome on an errand—and there I suddenly saw in strong and clear outlines the form for what I had to say.

I threw to the winds all that I had been unavailingly torturing myself with for a whole year, and in the middle of July began something new, which progressed as nothing has ever progressed with me before. The work is new, in the sense that I only began to write it then, but the subject and the mood have been weighing on me like a nightmare ever since the many lamentable political occurrences at home first made me examine myself and the condition of our national life, and think about things that before had passed me lightly by. It is a dramatic poem, modern in subject, serious in

⁷ *Letters*, p. 85 f.

tone, five acts in rhymed verse (not a second *Love's Comedy*). The fourth act is now nearly finished, and the fifth I feel I can write in a week. I work both in the morning and the afternoon, a thing I have never been able to do before.

I believe that in the revelation Ibsen experienced in St. Peter's, Hettner's teachings, especially his superlative praise of *Coriolanus*, were of prime importance. For Ibsen thereupon not only made Brand the tragic hero of a drama instead of the author's mouth-piece in an epic, but he also made him as like *Coriolanus* as would be possible considering the data and the setting with which Ibsen started.

Practically the entire story as far as we have it in the *Epic Brand*, down to minute details, is used in the drama. One striking change, however, is found in the scene in which Brand enters the village where the starving population are receiving their dole. In the epic version Brand preaches a stirring sermon, quite in keeping with his calling as a preacher. But in the drama Brand gains the admiration and the following of the masses by the same means through which *Coriolanus* does it in Shakespeare's drama, namely, by risking his life in a deed of almost superhuman bravery. Brand sails the boat through the storm in the face of almost certain death, just as *Coriolanus* had alone entered the city of Corioli. These acts influence the attitude of the Norwegian and the Roman populace toward the respective heroes in a decisive manner. It is evident at a glance how much *Brand* gained in dramatic force by this change.

Unlike Peer Gynt's God, Ibsen was economical—this is one of his most characteristic traits as an author. To what an amazing extent this economy is carried out in working over the *Epic Brand* into the drama is told in detail and with some amusement by Karl Larsen in his introduction to the *Epic Brand*.⁸ Practically all the characters of the drama already have their place in the epic: Brand (at one time called Koll), his mother, Agnes, Einar, Gerd, the Doctor, the Clerk, and the villagers. The models for these characters were to a large extent derived from persons Ibsen had observed in his travels in the mountains of Norway in the summer of 1862; from the same experience he derived the general setting,

⁸ *Henrik Ibsens Sämmtliche Werke*, Zweite Reihe, 2ter Bd., Berlin, 1909, pp. 47-91.

down to such details as the particular kind of parsonage, the dilapidated church, and the ice-church. La Chesnais⁹ is of the opinion that though one cannot even guess from the remains of the *Epic Brand* (it extends about as far as the end of Act I of the play) how the plot was to proceed, it seems quite certain that the hero's death through an avalanche was already determined through the death in 1863 in the same manner of a missionary to Africa, H. C. Knudsen, whom Ibsen had known some years previously in Bergen, and who has a number of similarities to Brand. In view of the fact that the setting and all the chief characters of the drama were quite fixed in the *Epic Brand* it is interesting to note which characters Ibsen added in the dramatic *Brand*: the Mayor, the Dean, the Sexton, and the Schoolmasters, *i. e.* the leaders of the people who correspond to the Tribunes in *Coriolanus*, forming the opposition to the hero.

It would be hard to find two other characters in the works of great dramatists who are spiritually so closely akin as are Brand and Coriolanus. In a famous letter to George Brandes from Dresden, June 26, 1869, Ibsen makes a statement that many critics have quarreled with:¹⁰

Brand has been misconstrued, at least as regards my intention (to which you may answer that the critic is not concerned with the intention). The misconstruction has evidently arisen from the fact of Brand's being a priest, and from the problem being of a religious nature. But both these circumstances are entirely unimportant. I could have constructed the same syllogism just as easily on the subject of a sculptor or a politician, as of a priest.

Shakespeare constructed this same syllogism with tragic inevitability on the subject of a politician, Coriolanus, who wishes to become consul but is too proud to ask the people for their votes. Brand shows the same unreasonable pride on numerous occasions.

⁹ The best account, so far as I know, of the journey of Ibsen in 1862 as a source for *Brand*, making use of Ibsen's notes recently turned over to the University Library in Oslo by Madame Bergliot Ibsen after Sigurd Ibsen's death in 1930, is found in the introduction to Volume VII of *Henrik Ibsen, Oeuvres Complètes*, traduites par P. G. La Chesnais, Paris, 1935. The introductions in this edition are of great value to Ibsen scholars, both for the material they present as well as for the bibliographical indications in the footnotes.

¹⁰ *Letters*, p. 173.

The essential quality of both is a heroic hardness that leads them to deeds of bravery but also to unpardonable excesses; Coriolanus, the patriot, goes over to the army of the enemy and attacks Rome, while Brand, the priest, causes through his fanaticism, the death of his wife and child. Due to the paradox in each of the two characters every reader is at liberty to regard Coriolanus as a noble Roman or as a traitor, while *Brand* was received by numerous readers as an edifying religious tract (against which Ibsen protested in the letter to Brandes), and yet Shaw can say quite justly:¹¹ "Brand dies a saint, having caused more intense suffering by his saintliness than the most talented sinner could possibly have done with twice his opportunities."

Incidentally, both of these feelings regarding the respective heroes are held by the mob; at first each is acclaimed as a great leader; later Brand is driven out with stones, while Coriolanus is to be hurled from "the rock Tarpeian." Naturally enough both express great contempt for the *mobile vulgus*:

You common cry of curs! whose breath I hate
 As reek o' the rotten fens, whose loves I prize
 As the dead carcasses of unburied men
 That do corrupt my air.

Coriolanus, Act III, Scene 3.

First God's image you outwear,
 Live the beast within you bare,
 Then to Mercy cry your needs,
 Seeking God—as invalids!
 So, His Kingdom's overthrown.
 What should he with souls effete
 Groveling at his mercy-seat?

Brand, Act V.

And, if possible, even more contempt for the leaders of the "mutable, rank-scented many":

Behold, these are the tribunes of the people,
 The tongues of the common mouth; I do despise them;
 For they do prank them in authority,
 Against all noble sufferance.

Coriolanus, Act III, Scene 1.

Brand says to the Mayor with scathing sarcasm:

So all your cunning, all your art,
 Aimed but to win the people's heart?

Brand, Act IV.

¹¹ G. B. Shaw, *The Quintessence of Ibsenism*, New York, 1913, p. 54.

On the subject of the hero's tragic guilt Ibsen had read in Hettner:¹²

Coriolan geht nicht zu Grunde, weil er ein starrer Aristokrat ist, das Volk verachtet und diesem seine wohlerworbenen Rechte rauben will; er geht zu Grunde, weil er sich durch seinen beleidigten Stolz sogar zum höchsten Verbrechen, zum Verrat am Vaterlande, fortreiszen lässt.

Coriolan, obwohl edel und grosz, ist zugrunde gegangen an seinem Trotze, der sich nicht scheute das Vaterland zu verraten aus beleidigter Eitelkeit.

The Doctor in Act III sums up Brand's character by saying that he has *quantum satis* of Will, but his *conto caritatis* presents a white, virginal page. In other words, Brand and Coriolanus are essentially noble, but both also possess a tragic flaw that leads to their downfall.

A comparison with Coriolanus sheds light also on the much-discussed ending of *Brand*, where the dying hero asks whether a *quantum satis* of Will would carry weight with God, whereupon a Voice calls through the crashing thunder: "He is the Deus caritatis." Theology should have no place in the interpretation of this scene; Ibsen protests against this in the letter to Brandes quoted above. It means simply that the poet gives his stamp of approval to the hero, despite the latter's faults. Similarly in the last scene of *Coriolanus* the First Lord is made to say of the murdered Coriolanus, a traitor to his country:

Bear from hence his body;
And mourn you for him; let him be regarded
As the most noble corse that ever herald
Did follow to his urn.

In other plays, *e. g.* *Julius Caesar* and *Hamlet*, Shakespeare uses the same device. Since Brand is buried by an avalanche, Ibsen could not have his hero borne off-stage by his opponents to the accompaniment of a generous eulogy, but he had to use a "Voice." For this Goethe had set him an example in *Faust*.

While Ibsen succeeded in making Brand a noble, tragic character who meets an inevitable doom quite comparable to Shakespeare's Coriolanus, yet there is one respect in which the Norwegian patriot, still beside himself with wrath over the shameful betrayal of Denmark, "the brother in need," fell far short of what *The Tragedy*

¹² Hettner, *op. cit.*, pp. 26, 31.

Muse with "those eyes that look inward and yet through and far beyond the outward object they are fixed on" might have taught him. In portraying Brand's opponents he was not objective; he did not treat the Mayor, the Dean, the Schoolmaster or the Sexton with the fairness with which Shakespeare paints his tribunes who, it must be admitted, "are fighting the battle of their class with prudence, intelligence, and skill, against the stupidity and oppression of the upper class."¹³ Ibsen himself recognized and criticized this, for it is printed in his official biography written by Henrik Jaeger. The passage must have come directly from Ibsen, since he was the only one to know of the existence of an *Epic Brand* prior to about 1900:¹⁴

It was first begun by Ibsen as an epic poem; when he afterward gave preference to the dramatic form, he considered dramatic requirements only in so far as they were fitted to his polemical aim. He gave little attention to probability or to strict dramatic motive; these matters were of little consequence in the ideal sphere in which his hero was placed; he did not even take pains to make his characters speak as it might be supposed they actually would speak; he was so engaged by his controversial and satirical aims that his characters were made to satirize themselves in comically overdrawn descriptions.¹⁵

A. E. ZUCKER

The University of North Carolina

¹³ Stopford A. Brooke, *On Ten Plays of Shakespeare*, New York, 1916, p. 226.—My friend, Mr. Juul Dieserud of the Library of Congress, has called my attention to the fact that the Norwegian *Foged* (translated in the William Archer edition as "mayor") was in no sense chosen by the people as their leader, but was appointed by the King, as were also the district doctor and the Provst (dean). The *Foged* was a tax collector and the head of the sheriffs or bailiffs (*lensmenn*) of his district of half a dozen parishes. These men are not leaders of the people interested in raising their position as are the tribunes, but rather deceivers who lie to the congregation shamelessly, *e. g.*, in regard to the opportunities for catching herring. Brand scorns the people for their spiritual lukewarmness, Coriolanus for their general inferiority. Owing to the fact that the hero of one play is a priest and of the other a politician the parallelism between the two dramas is far from complete in detail.

¹⁴ Jaeger, *op. cit.*, p. 186.

¹⁵ While I was engaged on this article my colleague George Coffin Taylor asked me one day whether I did not think that Shakespeare's *Coriolanus* had influenced Ibsen's *An Enemy of the People*, especially in the spirit of contempt for the mob manifested by the chief character of each play. I

POETIC FORM IN *CONQUISTADOR*

In the various reviews that I have chanced to see of Archibald MacLeish's interesting Pulitzer prize poem of 1932, *Conquistador*, I have not noticed any reference to the apparent indebtedness of the line form in that poem to Old English verse. The normal line of Old English poetry, of course, is a line of four accents, broken by a cesura and united by alliteration, the alliterative letter appearing in the first accented syllable of the second half line, and one or two accented syllables in the first half line. Mr. MacLeish has not used a line with exactly these characteristics very often in his poem, but he has employed one or more of these characteristic devices with so great frequency that the similarity of effect is striking. Furthermore some lines may be selected that follow the Old English pattern very faithfully. Thus

We that to west now: weirdless by fates faring
Follow on star-track; trust have we neither now.

(p. 52, 1932 ed.)

Here the first line is of type A, as classified by Professor Sievers. Again, other examples;

(p. 25)	Westward under the wind: by wave wandered.
(<i>Ibid.</i>)	Of difficult ways there were and the winter's snow
(p. 63)	That way do they stand on the ships at Saltes
(p. 11)	These words were my life; these letters written.
(p. 80)	All the crows of the sky have crossed our fires,
(p. 102)	Taste the salt of their tears on their silent tongues.

Each half of this last line conforms to Professor Sievers's type B line. One might cite other examples, but these, distributed as they

certainly believe that this is true, even though immediate sources can be cited in Ibsen's ostracism after the publication of *Ghosts*, in Thaulow, Björnson, and Jonas Lie as models. (Cf. any good discussion of the play, for example in Koht). Since I have nowhere found any discussion of the provenience of the title I should like to suggest here that it was derived from *Coriolanus* (Act I, Sc. 1): "First, you know Caius Marcius is chief enemy to the people" or (Act III, Sc. 3) "— he is banished as enemy to the people and his country." In the Danish translation the first is rendered "Folkets Erkefjende" (the people's arch-enemy) which is very similar to Ibsen's title, "En Folkefjende," quite like the second which is translated, "— som Folkets og som Faedrelandets Fjende."

are through some seventy-five pages, indicate the influence of the form.

More frequent are lines in which the cesura is placed much as in Old English poetry but with the alliteration lacking, or not arranged as in Old English.

(p. 1)	Veering the clay bluff: in another wind
(p. 2)	Dark is the past: none waking walk there
(<i>Ibid.</i>)	Sun is slight in their teeth as a seed's taste—
(p. 3)	Stirs in the young hair: and the smoky candle
(p. 4)	Torpid with old death: under sullen years.
(p. 28)	Clever under the bit: the mare La Rabona
(p. 80)	Nevertheless we go on: we are not returning
(p. 81)	That land was under us! There were the longed-for skies.

One more example may be chosen of four successive lines to illustrate the effect of the half-line form:

(p. 29)	Mouths sour with sleep: the purpling flesh Crawling under the thin cloths: and at dawn the Captain out in the oared boat: and we hoised the Jibs on the rest of them: getting the low airs; yawning.
---------	---

Constant as is the use of the cesura placed in the middle of the line, the use of alliteration to point the emphatic word, as in Old English poetry, is still more frequent. One might cite scores of instances in which a reader with the rhythm of *Beowulf* in mind, feels the similarity of effect. The following illustrations will suffice, scattered over some hundred pages:

(p. 12)	Graves in the wild earth: in the godless sand:
(p. 14)	We were the first that found that famous country
(p. 43)	Sea ruffled with squalls; ships scattering:
(p. 19)	And the next day we sailed, and the sea was against us:
(p. 31)	And the stain of the foam on the long flank of the swells: So did we sail on, and the noon shade lay
(p. 42)	Sharp to starboard: standing to the equal winds.
(p. 56)	Slow too from our sleep went out that sail:
(p. 57)	And they bungled the blow in the bad light and the drum-beats:
(p. 63)	The sun like a stale moon with the stringy scud.

Other lines though not conforming to the exact Old English pattern are yet close to it in effect, containing both the cesura and alliteration:

(p. 13)	This was brine in the mouth: bitterest foam,
(<i>Ibid.</i>)	The dates of empire: the dry skull of fame:

(p. 17) We that had gear to our flesh and the gold to find.
(p. 38) And standing away out: for the shoals were flat.

Furthermore, when Mr. MacLeish departs from the Old English form, as he does in much of the poem, he sometimes makes use of exactly the same freedom that Old English poets permit themselves. Thus we have the line,

(p. 89) And the leaves of the tree were dark, and a dew came down from them.

This line may be compared with the first line in the Epilogue of *The Wanderer*.

Swa cwæþ snottor on mode, gesæt him sundor æt rune.

In both cases we have three instead of two stresses in the half line, while the alliteration is perhaps more emphatic in the modern example.

In addition to these similarities of line, certain expressions emphasize the close relationship between the style of *Conquistador* and that, for instance, of *Beowulf*. Thus we have,

(p. 52) Wierdless: by fates *faring* Follow on *star-track*—
(p. 69) Wold was that country under heaven *woodless*.

And also descriptive words, compounded in the characteristic Old English fashion, as, *Moon-path*, *sky-star*, *ship-road*. These instances seem to indicate that the detailed influence of the Old English poetic form by no means came to an end with *Piers Plowman*. Whether this influence is conscious or unconscious, very many of Mr. MacLeish's lines depart no farther from the Old English model than do the lines of various scholarly translators of *Beowulf* who have tried to preserve the original meter, hampered as such an attempt must always be by the absence of true long syllables and the dependence only on accent characteristic of modern English poetry. Indeed the lines quoted as examples are as close to the Old English form as many lines in that early Middle English poem, *Brut*.

It may be added that the skilful adaptation of this form to fit the genius of modern English verse does much to make *Conquistador* a striking and original work.

W. E. AIKEN

The University of Vermont

REVIEWS

Friedrich Kluge, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*
 Elfte Auflage Mit Unterstützung durch Wolfgang Krause
 bearbeitet von ALFRED GÖTZE. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter &
 Co., 1934. xv + 740 pp. M. 18.

Kluge died in 1926, two years after the appearance of the tenth edition of the *Wörterbuch*. Blind since 1902, he had had to depend on the eyes of others to keep him informed of the work that was being done in the field of German etymology and lexicography. The new eleventh edition therefore required much more re-working to bring it up to date than would otherwise have been necessary. This explains the considerable increase in bulk, 740 pages, as compared with 558 pages of the tenth, and 519 pages of the ninth edition. The most recent additions to the German language have been recorded, with their dates wherever possible: e. g. *Gillette*; *Jazz* (1912); *Kodak* (1905); *Mah-Jong* (1923). More space has been devoted to the registration of the earliest appearance of German words, a field in which previously the Weigand-Hirt Dictionary stood out pre-eminently. In general, the work done by American scholars has been adequately recorded, *MLN.*, for example, being cited as a source in thirty or more instances; in addition, there are probably as many more cases in which the material published here has been utilized and even repeated verbatim, without indication of its provenience.¹

The following additions and corrections may perhaps prove useful in the preparation of the twelfth edition:

ABBILD is cited from Haller, 1730: as early as 1718 Kirsch² records the noun *Abbildung*, which is missing in the *DWb.*, and the verb *abbilden*.

ABFÜTTERUNG is cited as a "modernes Scherzwort" of 1807: Kirsch records the verb *abfüttern*, 'Pabulum *praebere* sihe sättigen.'

¹ For example, in the case of *ROTGLIEßER* we are informed: "Zuerst 1412 *Monum. mediæ aevi hist. res gestas Poloniae illustrantia* 7, 405" (cf. *MLN.*, XXXVIII, 407); *Stichwort* "1420 *Liv.*, *est.* und *kurländ.* *Urk.-Buch* 5, 668 *Bunge*" (cf. *MLN.*, XXXVIII, 408); *TORTE* "auf dt. Boden seit 1418 *Liüb.* *Urk.-B.* 6, 88 *unam tortam sicut in nupciis*" (cf. *MLN.*, XXXIX, 356); *VEKIEREN* "zuerst in Prag 1468 *Fontes rer. austr.*, II, 20, 530 'Jersik ist widergekorth keyn Prage vnd wil vns mühen vnd vexiren'" (cf. *MLN.*, XXXVI, 490).

² *Abundantissimum cornu copiae linguae latinae et germanice selectum . . . Opera et Studio Adami Friderici Kirschii, Opus denuo recognitum et aliquot mille Vocabulis auctum, Noribergae 1718. 1152 + 376 pp., 44 unnumbered leaves with Appendices.* The preface is dated 1713: presumably the first edition appeared then. Götze several times cites a later edition of this important dictionary, but does not seem to have made consistent use of it.

ABMURKSEN is cited from a text of 1800, and reference is made to dialectic variations in meaning such as "murksen herumarbeiten, herumschneiden, herumpfuschen." Compare with these the much earlier verb *abmutzen*, again cited by Kirsch, 1718: "abmutzen den Bäumen die Gipfel, *detruncare arbores, capita arborum succidere*." Kirsch also records *abmutzer, mutilans; abmutzung, mutilatio, detruncatio*. Compare furthermore Schmeller's note (*Bayer. Wbch. I, 1707*) *s. v. Mutz*: "Falls das anderwärts vorkommende mutzen (stutzen, zustutzen, decurtare, ital. mozzare; Diez Wbch. 233 f. BM II, 281) welches, wo nicht selbst aus murz entstellt, mit den Artikeln Mutz, Mutzen, Mutzel zu vergleichen ist, hier zu entfernt scheinen sollte. . . ."

ABSPENSTIG, attributed to Steinbach 1734 and Frisch 1741, is likewise recorded by Kirsch, 1718.

ABWESENHEIT: its predecessor, the noun *Abwesen*, is quoted by the *DWb.* from Luther's Bible (1522); it may be traced back to the pre-Lutheran Bible: *in mein abwesent* (Mentel, 1466, *Philippians, 2, 12*) whereas the much earlier manuscripts here have *in meinem abwesen*. *Hebr. 4, 1* the Zainer Bible of 1473 has: 'daz er seye in abwesen.'

ADVOKAT is recorded as "Ende des 15. Jh. bereits üblich": compare the much earlier instances: *Und der selbe advocate* (1392); *fragete dornoch den advocaten* (1408); *Unser advocat lies mich dies wissen* (1420); *unsirs ordens advocat . . . unser advocatus . . . Unser advocat . . . mit iren advocaten* (1421), all in *MLN.*, xxxvi, 484.

ANGELEGENHEIT: "gebucht seit Steinbach 1734"; compare Kirsch 1718: "Angelegenheit, *Studium, Cura*. Wichtige Angelegenheit, *Res major. Res magni momenti. Caussa major*. Sich immer in eines Angelegenheit finden lassen, *Frequentem alicui operam dare*. Angelegenheit vieler Händel, *Negotiositas*."

ATTENTAT, attributed to the period of the Thirty Years' War, may be found cited from the *Zimmerische Chronik* (1566) in *MLN.*, xxxiv, 414.

AUFWIEGELN is cited from Maaler, 1561: compare *MLN.*, xxxvii, 396 ff., where instances of *aufwigeln, aufwiegler, aufwigung* are cited from the years 1476, 1488, 1499, 1509. From documents dealing with the Peasants' War the form *Ufwidler* is repeatedly cited.

BANDIT is cited from Frisius 1541 and Maaler 1561: compare Edlibach's *Chronik* of the year 1513: 'uor den banditten vnd francoesen die noch allenthalben jn schlossen lagen' (*MLN.*, xxxiv, 414).

BARBIER is called "frühnhd."; the word first appears as *barbirer*: "Is kumpt zu euch Nickel barbirer von den Cotten, unser alter diener" (Joh. Friedr. Boehmer, *Codex diplomaticus moenofrancofurtanus*, p. 655: letter of Emperor Charles IV, dated June 26, 1358). The earliest instance of the spelling *barbier*, of the year 1461, is cited *MLN.*, xxxvi, 485.

BLINDEKUH: the synonym *Guggebergen*, quoted by Götze, may be cited as early as 1647 from Schönsleder's *Promptuarium Germanico-latinum*, fol. 15: "Guggebergen, corrupte, pro Khüebergen, vaccae latebrae: veteribus diffugium. est genus ludi puerorum. Ioach. Camer." The philologist Joachim Camerarius (1500-1574) was the author of more than 150 works, now very scarce: his *Commentarii utriusque linguae*, 1551, were used as a dictionary, and Schönsleder may well refer to this book.

BÖHNHASE: an additional synonym is *Ferkenstecher*: fremde also genante Ferkestecher und Bunhasen (*MLN.*, xxxvi, 485).

DESPOT: ". . . wird bei uns im 16. Jh. bekannt als Titel der Fürsten von Serbien, Bulgarien usw." Cf. *MLN.*, xxxv, 407 f., where instances of the years 1423, 1428, 1479, 1481 are cited in the spelling *dispot*. To these may now be added four instances of the year 1460, spelled *Distbot*, *Dischbott* (*Schweiz. Geschichtsforscher*, vii, 332, 334, 398).

FASCHINE is first cited from the year 1678: compare *MLN.*, xliv, 139 for an instance of the year 1653, in the spelling *fasine*.

FEHLTRITT: "gebucht nicht vor Frisch 1741"; compare Schönsleder, *Promptuarium Germanico-latinum*, 1647, fol. N₉b: "Fühltritt, fallens vestigium. fallente vestigio cecidit"; similarly Kirsch, 1718: "fehl-Tritt, *Excessus*. fehl-Tritt thun, *Exorbitare*. *Titubare*."

FUNDGRUBE is cited from 1476 (Lexer); compare *MLN.*, xxxvi, 486: und verleihen in auch die ersten fundgrub derselben erczt (*Fontes rerum austriacarum*, II, 47: 1454).

HAGEL: the synonyms *Kissel* 'Hagelstein' and *kisseln* 'hageln' may be cited from Erasmus Alberus,³ 1542: "Da kam ein grosser Regen, vnd donnert vnd blitzt, vnd kisselt, das die kisseln gefallen waren so hoch als mewren" (chap. 249); a marginal note asks the question: Wie kamen sie denn durch die Kissel heim?

KOMPONIEREN: this word, cited by Weigand-Hirt from the year 1571, is also used by Erasmus Alberus, chap. 341: "Christus hat die Regel Francisci componiert, ordinirt vnd defensiert."

KORAN: the form *Alkoran*, which I cited *MLN.*, xxxviii, 400 from Heinrich von Eppendorf (1540), may now be supplemented by numerous instances from Erasmus Alberus, who even uses it in the title of his book: *Der Barfuser Münche Eulenspiegel vnd Alcoran*; similarly: "eim Buch, welchs sie nennen, *Librum Conformatum*, vnd ist der Barfuser Alcoran" (fol. *ij); "Wenn die Wunderwerck, in der Barfuser Alcoran geschrieben, alle geschehen weren" (*ibid.*); "das der wunder werck, in irem Alcoran geschrieben, etliche geschehen sind" (fol. *ij); "wer jren Alcoran gar auslieset" (*ibid.*); "Wunderwerck aus der Barfuser Bibel oder Alcoran geschrieben" (fol. *iv); in one instance the noun seems

³ *Der Barfuser Münche Eulenspiegel vnd Alcoran*. Mit einer Vorrede D. Martini Luth. . . . M.D.XLII.

to be feminine, doubtless by attraction to Bibel: "Im ersten Blat der Barfusser Alcoran, kniet ein Münch" (fol. A₁).

KRIEG: "Ursprung dunkel." The editors had evidently not seen Sehrt's perfectly plausible derivation of the word *Krieger* from Latin (*miles gregarius*, *MLN.*, XLII, 410).

KÜRASSIER: the form *kürisser* is cited from the year 1474; compare the form *Küresser*, ca. 1449-50, in Ludwig von Eyb's *Denkwürdigkeiten brandenb. Fürsten*, 1849, p. 119.

MAMELUCK: the form *Ammeluck* occurs three times in a text of 1460: "zweyhundert Ammeluckhen, das seind verläugnete Christen" (*Schweizer. Geschichtsforscher*, VII, 359); similarly pp. 353, 389.

MARIENGLAS: the synonym *Frauenglas* may be cited as early as 1718 from Kirsch, p. 119.

QUARTIERMEISTER: an instance from the fifteenth century may now be cited from Ulrich's "Acten zum Neusser Kriege" (*Annalen d. hist. Ver. Niederrh.* Hft. 49, p. 124): "dat die quattermeistere van allen rotten der voissknechten . . ." (Köln, 1475).

SCHICKSAL may be cited as early as 1718 from Kirsch, p. 257.

SCHUTZENGEL occurs frequently in Klopstock's *Messias*, e. g. in the *Erklärung der Kupfer* and the *Inhaltsangabe* of the various cantos (Ed. of Halle, 1751, pp. x, 2, 32, 70, 102). Wieland uses it in *Sympathien*, 1756: "Lange schaut sie ihn an, wie ein Schuzengel" (Edition of the Berlin Academy, II, 465, 5).

SCHUTZGEIST: "kaum vor Wieland 1767 Irdis 5, Str. 15, 23." The word is older, however: in 1746-47 J. A. Cramer uses it as the title of a periodical: *Der Schutzgeist. Ein moralisches und satyrisches Wochenblatt* (Goedeke IV, 1, 68, 1) b.). Wieland uses the word in his earliest writings: "Ich sah und staunte noch, als mich mein Schutzgeist rührte" (*Zwölf moralische Briefe*, 1752, Academy Ed., I, 305, 113); ". . . die Liebe wird euch nun Der Schutzgeist seyn" (*Erzählungen*, 1752, *ibid.*, I, 367, 345 f.); ". . . als ihr Schutzgeist In Traumgestalten . . . Vor ihr erschien" (*ibid.*, I, 417, 354 ff.); "Dem Orte zu, den ihr der Schutzgeist zeigte" (*ibid.*, I, 418, 414); "Sey mir gegryßt, mein heiliger Schutzgeist" (*Der Fryhling*, 1752, *ibid.*, 432, 199); "Ich bat meinen Schutzgeist mir dieses Gesicht zu erklären" (*Gesicht des Mirza*, 1755, *ibid.*, II, 300, 9).

SCHUTZGOTT, not treated by Götze, is recorded by Kirsch, 1718; it appears in Wielands *Erzählungen*, 1752: "weil ihn die Erd als Schutzgott ehrte" (Academy Ed., I, 354, 53). Probably Wieland used *Schutzgeist* and *Schutzgott* in preference to *Schutzengel* for metrical reasons.

SERAPHISCH, cited by Weigand-Hirt from Rollenhagen, 1603, occurs as early as 1542 in Erasmus Alberus: "weil er auff erden vom Seraphischen fewer entzünd, Christo gleichförmig worden ist" (chap. 15): "das Franciscus von Seraphischem fewer, entzünd, . . .

gar Verendert werden solt" (chap. 17); "Lvcifer war vom höchsten Orden, nemlich vom Seraphischen" (chap. 18).

STIGMATISIEREN: this verb cited by Weigand-Hirt from the year 1834, also occurs in Erasmus Alberus, together with the noun *Stigmatisation*: "Gott hat Franciscum . . . erhaben, erhöhet, stigmatisiert, vnd mit seinen Fünff wunden gemalzeichnet" (chap. 33); "vnd ich ward gewar, das ich Stigmatisiert war" (chap. 558); "steig bey den stigmatisierten Franciscum" (chap. 576); "also hat Franciscus zwey jar gelebt nach seiner Stigmatisation" (chap. 564); "Ein barfuser Münch zweiuelt an der stigmatisation Francisci" (chap. 566). It may be added that *malzeichnen*, cited above as a synonym of *stigmatisieren*, is not recorded in the *DWB*.

UND: for the history of this conjunction compare E. H. Sehrt, "Zur Geschichte der westgerm. Konjunktion *Und*" (*Hesperia*, Nr. 8, 1916).

ZARTGEFÜHL is cited from the year 1789: its forerunner is the expression *aus zartem Gefühl*, used by Wieland in the *Merkur* for 1780, III, 151 (Academy Ed., XIV, 232, 16); compare also: *jenes zarte Gefühl*, *Agathon* (1764), II, 166.

W. KURRELMAYER

Faust. Translated into English Prose with Introduction and Notes by F. G. G. SCHMIDT, Ph. D. Leipzig: Emil Rohmkopf, 1933.

J. Wolfgang von Goethe. Faust. Parts One and Two. Translated from the German by GEORGE MADISON PRIEST. New York: Covici-Friede (1932). xxxvii + 420 pp. \$5.00.

The First Part of Goethe's Faust. Translated from the German by JOHN SHAWCROSS, M. A., with a Foreword by Dr. G. P. Gooch, President of the English Goethe Society. London: E. Partridge Limited at the Scholartis Press, 1934. vi + 189 pp.

Goethe's Poems and Aphorisms. Edited for the Goethe Society of America by FRIEDRICH BRUNS. New York: Oxford University Press, 1932. xviii + 211 pp. \$1.25.

Goethe. Voyage en Italie. Traduction nouvelle complète avec notes. Par le Dr. MAURICE MUTTERER. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1930. (= Bibliothèque de la Revue de Littérature Comparée, Tome 71).

Faust, der Nichtfaustische. Von WILHELM BÖHM. Halle a. S.: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1933. 136 S. Mk. 5.60.

Die drei hier vorliegenden Faustübersetzungen stellen jede einen Typus ihrer Art dar und ergänzen sich. Bescheidenen Anspruches

gibt F. G. G. Schmidt neben dem Goetheschen Texte auf der linken Seite eine einfache, möglichst wörtliche Prosaübersetzung auf der rechten. Es ergibt sich allerdings dabei, daß Genauigkeit zuweilen durchaus nicht Richtigkeit bedeutet, denn "Dear God" ist kaum dasselbe wie *Du lieber Gott* (3211), "coupling" nicht dasselbe wie *kupplerisch*. Die Übersetzung könnte sicher nicht auf eigenen Beinen stehen in: "On his kisses I should perish"—*An seinen Küs sen vergehen sollt* (3412); "Why do I feel so sad upon your neck"—*Warum wird mir an deinem Halse so bang* (4487). Stichproben ergaben des Weiteren die folgenden Aussstellungen: 2769 "his heir" ist richtig, aber der deutsche Text *seinen* falsch; 4161 "wise" ist kaum der rechte Ausdruck für die Klugheit Nikolais; 685 *Was der Augenblick erschafft* ist mit "brings forth" als zu zufällig gekennzeichnet. Warum nicht "creates"? 1325 *weidlich* bedeutet *nach allen Regeln der Kunst*, also nicht "with a vengeance," wenn man schon auf Wörtlichkeit dringt.

Vorwort und Einleitung sind etwasdürftig; wenn es in der Wiedergabe der Handlung z. B. heißt "until he settles on the thought of suicide," so ist damit so wenig gesagt, daß die Erzählung sich überhaupt erübrigte. Dieser Selbstmord ist doch Selbsterweiterung und nicht Selbstvernichtung. Die Anmerkungen sind im Ganzen ausreichend, nur hier und da möchte man Zusätze wünschen, z. B. warum Herr Schwertlein in Neapel sterben mußte, kann man nicht erraten; und wenn es von Rippach heißt: "it used to serve as a butt for ridicule to the people of Leipzig in particular," so gehörte das "butt" eher dem anrüchigen Hans (der unerklärt bleibt) als seinem Rippach.

Alles in allem ist eine solche einfache, wörtliche Wiedergabe durchaus berechtigt, für gewisse Zwecke förderlich und dankbar zu begrüßen. Es wäre zu wünschen, daß der Übersetzer sich der gleichen Mühe für den zweiten Teil unterzöge, der allerdings denn wohl etwas stärker kommentiert werden müßte.

Das Goethesche Gedicht vom *Rezensenten* drängt sich auf, wenn der Kritiker einer Leistung wie der der Versübersetzung beider Teile des *Faust* von George Madison Priest in kurzer Besprechung gerecht werden soll, zumal diese zugleich die Arbeit des Forschers und Deuters einschließt. Der "Hund" ist also des Totschlags als gerechter Strafe gewärtig.

Der Übertragung geht vorauf ein kurzer Bericht über die Faustsage, ein erzählender Leitfaden durch die Gesamthandlung und eine Bibliographie (in der ich den nicht zu übersehenden Van der Smissen unter den Vorgängern vermisste). Erklärende Anmerkungen, aufs Nötigste weise beschränkt, folgen am Schluß. Daß Priest sich nicht gescheut hat zu borgen und zu übernehmen, wo vorher Gutes gelungen ist, versteht sich von selbst und muß als Vorteil gebucht werden. Auch Teile einer handschriftlichen Übersetzung von Wm. Page Andrews sind eingearbeitet. Es bleibt ohne

das eine Riesenauflage, die gelöst werden muß und mit wechselndem Glücke gelöst worden ist. Mir scheint, daß zumal Partieen mit längeren und strengeren Versen dem Übersetzer besser liegen. Vergleicht man seine Leistung mit der von John Shawcross, einem Engländer, so ergeben sich gewisse durchlaufende Charakteristika: Bei Priest stärkere Neigung zu romanischem Wortschatz und konventionellerem Ausdruck, statischerem Gebrauch des Verbs (Progressivform und Partizip), größere Breite wenn auch gewöhnlich stärkerer Anschluß ans Original in Syntax, Reimstellung und Melodie; bei Shawcross gedrungenerer Stil, bewegterer und dynamischerer Gang, Freiheiten in innerer und äußerer Form und geringeres Zurückgreifen auf die Übersetzungstradition, statt dessen oft die kräftigsten Neuschöpfungen, die trotzdem im Geist Goethes verhaftet bleiben. Ein paar Beispiele mögen dies erläutern:

PRIEST

308 ff.

THE LORD:

Although he serves me now confusedly,
I soon shall lead him forth where all is clear.
The gardener knows, when verdant grows the tree,
That bloom and fruit will deck the coming year.

MEPHISTOPHELES:

What will you wager? Him you yet shall lose,
If you will give me your permission To lead him gently on the path I choose.

THE LORD:

As long as on the earth he shall survive,
So long you'll meet no prohibition.
Man errs as long as he does strive.

MEPHISTOPHELES:

I like to see the Old Man not infrequently,
And I forbear to break with Him or be uncivil;
It's very pretty in so great a Lord as He
To talk so like a man e'en with the Devil.

534 ff.

FAUST:

Unless you feel, naught will you ever gain;

SHAWCROSS

If still he serves me in his own blind way,
I soon shall lead him to the light of day;
The gardener knows, when once the buds appear,
That fruit and flowers will crown the coming year.

What do you wager? If you leave me free
To steer his course awhile judiciously,
I'll wean him from your service yet.

Agreed: while on the earth he lives,
You're welcome to adventure it:
For man must err, while still he strives.

I like to see the Old Man off and on,
And take good care he does'nt break with me:
'Tis really kind of such a Mighty One
To treat the Devil himself so affably.

Unless you feel it, you will ne'er come near it:

Unless this feeling pours forth from
your soul
With native, pleasing vigor con-
trol
The hearts of all your hearers, it
will be in vain.
Pray keep on sitting! And collect
and glue,
From others' feasts brew some
ragoût;
With tiny heaps of ashes play your
game,
And blow the sparks into a wretched
flame.

3851 ff.

MEPHISTOPELES:

How sadly rises, red and incomplete,
the dim
Moon's disk with its belated glow,
Lighting so ill that at each step or so
One runs against a rock, against a
tree!

Gretchen's Monolog am Spinnrade ist eine noch von beiden ungelöste Aufgabe geblieben. Warum hat noch niemand versucht, ein englisches Metrum zu substituieren, in dem eine Umdichtung möglich wäre? Denn dieses, so ausgesprochen deutsch, wird nie erfolgreich nachgeahmt werden können. Priest ist in Gretchen's Gebet im Zwinger zum Teil glücklicher im Ausdruck: "I'm weeping, weeping, weeping" ist besser als "I moan, I moan, I moan." Dagegen trägt in Valentins balladenartiger Rede Shawcross den Preis davon, trotz des anscheinenden Mißverständnisses in 3731
So sei's auch eben recht:

3722 ff.

VALENTINE:

I'm dying! That is quickly said
And quicker still can be.
Why, women, stand and howl and
wail?
Come here and listen to my tale!
My Gretchen, see! young are you still
And shrewd enough by no means
quite.
You manage your affairs but ill.
In confidence I tell you what is more,
Since once for all now you're a
whore,
So be one then outright!

Hoffentlich wird die Aufnahme der Shawcross'schen Übersetzung ihn veranlassen, uns auch den zweiten Teil zu schenken. Für eine

Unless the deep call from the soul
is sent,
To bind the hearts of all who hear it
With primal fathomless content.

Cling to your desks! Paste, patch
with tireless finger,
Hash up the scraps which others'
banquets spill,
And blow to flame the sorry sparks,
which linger
Within your heap of ashes still.

How sadly, rising late with lurid
glow
The crescent moon climbs up the sky,
And shines so dimly, that we fear
To stumble at each rock and tree!

I'm dying, that is quickly said:
And still more quickly done.
You women, why d'ye groan and
stand about
Come hither, hear me out.
My Gretchen, see, you're still a child,
You're much too easily beguiled:

You've managed things all wrong!
I tell you now, betwixt us twain,
You are a whore! so that is plain

And therewith ends the song.

würdige Ausstattung gebührt den Verlegern beider Übersetzungen der Dank des Publikums; die englische reiht sich der Wertherübertragung von Rose an, die amerikanische hat in Werner Helmer einen geschmackvollen Buchkünstler gefunden.

Die gut lesbare und leicht annotierte französische Übersetzung Mutterers von Goethes Italienischer Reise, von deren Gewissenhaftigkeit ich mich durch Stichproben überzeugen konnte, sei hier wenigstens angeführt. Eine ausführlichere Anzeige verdient die zweisprachige Ausgabe ausgewählter Gedichte Goethes, besorgt für die Goethe Society of America durch Friedrich Bruns. Auf 211 Seiten wird hier eine Auswahl der besten Gedichte Goethes und eine kleine Probe der Sprüche in Prosa gegeben mit den gelungensten Übersetzungen, die z. T. wenig, z. T. bedeutend überarbeitet sind, in mehreren Fällen aber sogar für den Band besonders gefertigt wurden. Unter den letzteren befinden sich einige der besten, wie der *Erlkönig* von Rothensteiner, *Natur und Kunst* von Lewisohn, *Der Bräutigam* vom Herausgeber. Die Titel auf Einband und Titelseite zeigen leider den Einschluß der Übertragungen nicht an.

Der Hoffnung, daß sich in Böhms Faustbuche manches Rätsel lösen möge, gesellt sich zugleich die Einsicht, daß auch manches Rätsel sich knüpft. Aber wie wäre das auch anders möglich bei einem Werk, das im Einzelnen und Ganzen fast zu allen Fausterklärungen im Widerspruch steht. Für Böhm ist der *Faust* getrennt von fast sämmtlichem Schaffen Goethes, im besonderen Kontrast zum *Wilhelm Meister*. Er sei "der eine chaotische Pol des polarischen Goethe, dessen Gegenpol Perfektibilität heißt, und die beide von der großen Harmonie der Menschlichkeit, der nichts Menschliches fremd ist, umfaßt werden (123)." Dieses Anschau des Lebens vom chaotischen Pol her zeigt demnach nichts von der "konzilianten Natur" Goethes, nichts von seinem Bestreben, Widersprüche zu harmonisieren, das Leben als "doch schön" zu sehen, sondern es wäre für diesen Schöpfer *Fausts* nur "doch schön."

Bei der Umwertung einzelner Stellen des Dramas, bei der Beurteilung der Faustischen Taten bekommt der Goethe Böhms nicht selten ein grimmes, schopenhauerisches Antlitz, und wir fragen uns naturgemäß, wie war es möglich, daß diese Bitterkeit, diese Zerissenheit, diese Dämonie sich so ausschließlich auf ein Werk des Dichters konzentrierte. Aber Böhm zeigt im letzten Kapitel Parallelen in andern Dramen Goethes auf, im *Tasso*, in den *Wahlverwandtschaften*, besonders aber und in überraschender Polarität in den Balladen; doch selbst hier noch steigert sich die tragische Weltschau nicht zu dem fast ungoethisch Karikaturistischen des Böhmschen *Faust*.

Indessen sind im Einzelnen wie im Ganzen von Böhm Zusammenhänge aufgedeckt, Möglichkeiten der Interpretation aufgezeigt, die keinesfalls leichtsinnig von der Hand gewiesen werden können.

Die von Böhm verurteilte perfektibilistische Auslegung ist bisher fast so ausschließlich herrschend gewesen, daß es uns schwer fallen wird, sofort eine objektive Einstellung gegen die nichtperfektibilistische zu gewinnen, mit der die Faustforschung sich ernstlich wird auseinandersetzen müssen. Denn das Buch ist in der Beherrschung des Stoffes und der Durchführung der Idee eine starke und ernste Leistung, wenn auch der Aufbau etwas verwirrend und die Sprachgebung zu beziehungsreich ist, um ein schnelles Erfassen zu erleichtern.

Auch fehlt ein Index; das dürfte man bei einem Werke dieser Art beinahe eine Ungezogenheit nennen.

ERNST FEISE

'Erkennen': Versuch einer Deutung der Grundidee in Goethes "Urfaust" und Clemens Brentanos "Romanzen vom Rosenkranz." By ALFRED TREPTOW. Königsberg i. Pr., 1932. Pp. 124.

Die innere Form der Romanzen vom Rosenkranz von Clemens Brentano. By GÜNTHER REICHARDT. Freiburg: Schles, 1934. Pp. 125.

Many a thin dissertation has come out of the scholarly world, but with the worst of intentions it cannot be said that these are two of them. Each author has an idea and each develops it without fear that someone may later embarrass by reference to a predecessor. Both are utterly unafraid when it is a question of overthrowing a Walzel or a Gundolf. Each barricades himself behind a stout bibliography, Treptow's being by far the larger with its 188 serious items. Treptow's is the more informative treatise, Reichardt's the more suggestive.

In 1928, Weissgräber, in writing on the preterite-present *kennen* set up the *kann: genui* equation, showed how *kennen* and *zeugen* existed for a while side-by-side until *kennen* finally won the victory. We are familiar in English with the reference to a book as a "brain child." Through 88 pages of his illuminating thesis, Treptow traces the relation of gnosis, *Magie, denken-sprechen, Magier-Übermensch, Magismus-Begierde* through the works of Plotin (Reichardt also leans on him), Augustin, Thomas von Aquino, Paracelsus, Jakob Böhme, Saint-Martin, Novalis, J. W. Ritter, Schelling, G. H. Schubert, Görres, and Franz von Baader. In this part of the discussion there is admittedly an element of the seminar paper: it reads a trifle like a catalogue. Yet we see in the end how, in the works of these writers, man as the image and mirror of God, was born to serve and rule, to receive and beget, to know and be known, and how man finally fell as a result of his

forsaking the celestial idea—the helping organ of knowing and creating and began to follow all that was tinged with the animal.

Treptow does not contend that Goethe derived his idea of knowing-begetting *Magie* from these writers; his was a case rather of parallel. They came by it partly through study; Goethe lived it at the time of the *Uraufzug*: S. v. Klettenberg, Paracelsus, and Herder. Likewise Brentano: He, according to Treptow, learned from Görres to look upon *Magie* as "metaphysische Erkenntnis- und Zeugungskraft," but it was the daimon in him that caused him to carry the idea to its apex in the lives of the three sisters and their step-brothers in the *Romanzen vom Rosenkranz*.

There is no denying the force of the argument; there is but one trouble. Faust found it impossible to the very end to rid himself of *Magie*, once he had gone over to it. How would we explain then the *Magie* that encircled Goethe-Faust from 1825 to 1832? Is it something that sticks once you have it? However this may be, the reference to the *Romanzen vom Rosenkranz* as a "katholischer Faust" takes on cumulative meaning from a study of this compiled and analyzed material, from a reading of this dissertation which is so different in tone or background from that of the theses sent out from non-German institutions.

This applies to Reichardt with added force. The very theme, "innere Form" is a German concept. The facts regarding Brentano's *Romanzen vom Rosenkranz* may be assumed.¹ Max Morris published a good edition in 1903; in 1910 Victor Michels brought out another edition, in the interests of greater clarity and usefulness. Morris's is however the better. He made fewer changes in the original. It is the formlessness of the work that has bothered wary and chary scholars more than general or aesthetic readers. Reichardt has analyzed with fractionless care, and in accordance with a graph for undertones of his own, the inner form of the work. He has done for Brentano what Lorenz did for Richard Wagner. He has taken up each separate *Romanze* (there are 19 in all), following Max Morris's edition, and shown the "form" that Brentano followed, consciously or unconsciously. With this done he is ready to conclude that the Romanticists in general and Brentano in particular had a "form" just as truly as any Classicist. It is a work of uncommon stimulation and pregnant suggestiveness.

Reichardt sets forth his thesis in these words:

Meine Aufgabe war es, an einem Beispiel die romantische Form herauszustellen, zu zeigen, dass es auch in der Romantik einen deutlichen Formwillen gibt. Es handelt sich um die reine Gestaltsbeschreibung der Romanzen vom Rosenkranz von Clemens Brentano. Es zeigte sich, dass in dem literarischen Kunstwerk sich dieselben Formen nachweisen lassen, die Lorenz in der romantischen Musik von Wagner fand.

¹ See the present writer's "The Romantic: Clemens Brentano's *Romanzen vom Rosenkranz*," *JEGP.*, xxxii (1933), 2, pp. 335-365,

The key-word here is *Wille*. Reichardt contends that Brentano wrote in what may be termed the *Bogenform*, that is, a theme is started, it rises gradually to a climax then slides back to the spiritual level from which it began. With this program outlined, he analyzes the *Romanzen vom Rosenkranz* (pages 27-97) with so great detail that only seeing is believing, only reading is understanding. By laying the text before one it is not only possible but enlightening to follow the formula. His *Bogenform*, visualized by the scheme a b a, does work out.

Whether we can apply the term *Wille* to the scheme is another matter. For there is such a bewilderment of incident in *Romanzen vom Rosenkranz* that one finds it hard to feel that Brentano exercised will power in the writing of a work that, whereas it covers only two days of acting time, covers virtually all time as to action. Though the longest "poem" in German, the plot is simple: Maria bruises the serpent's head and thereby redeems the family, whose blood relations were intricate to say the least, while Apo and Moles repair to a Mephistophelian doom. The actual rosary has but little to do with it. Brentano claimed he was writing an epic on the *Erfindung* of the rosary, yet his characters tell their beads throughout the epic with nonchalant anachronism.

In the part that deals with the *Romanzen vom Rosenkranz* in general, one-third of the whole, Reichardt is on more rational ground. His contention that all music has only inner form is more interesting than true. Absolute music does, program music has also an outer form. By the latter Reichardt means, in letters,

Fabel, äussere Handlung, Stil, Reim, Versbau oder Kleinrhythmus, der sich im Vers durch das immer wiederkehrende Mass von gleichviel Hebungen und Senkungen darstellt. All das kann man am Kunstwerk ablesen. Mit den Augen können wir aber die äussere Form sehen. . . . Die innere Form aber muss man in erster Linie empfinden.

The fragmentary nature of the outer form Reichardt regards as "ein Hauptkennzeichen des romantischen Formwillens." Nadler was the first exegete of this thesis. Reichardt argues that there is really nothing fragmentary about Schubert's *Unfinished Symphony*. The theory is interesting even if not sufficient as an excuse for all the Romantic fragments. Brentano himself remarked in this connection,

Jedes Kunstwerk, das vollendet,
Sprach er und zog hoch die Stirne
Muss, um klar sich auszusprechen
Stehn auf ewigen Begriffen.

(5th Romanze, p. 61, ed. Michels)

That the Romanticists' idea of form was to have no form is on a par with the oft-repeated expression that "es ihre Tendenz war, keine Tendenz zu haben." In the matter of propaganda the theory

holds: to champion nothing is to champion something for adherence to nothing after all represents an attitude. Form however, especially outer, somehow remains form.

The attempt to set Classicism off against Romanticism on the ground that the former has heroes but cannot use saints whereas the latter has saints but cannot use heroes admits of elaborate possibilities, injudicious though it is to say that Schiller's *Jungfrau* failed (*scheiterte*) because Schiller endeavored to make a heroine out of his saint. The persistent use that music makes of repetitions is ably set forth, impossible though it obviously is to offer this as an explanation of the repetitions (and contradictions) in the *Romanzen vom Rosenkranz*.

Reichardt writes:

So ist das Formprinzip, das Brentano und die anderen Romantiker in ihren Werken herausbildeten, als musikalisch zu bezeichnen. Es ist ein Musizieren mit Worten. Im Gegensatz zur plastischen Form der Klassik ist die Form der Romantik musikalisch.

Though not novel this does necessitate a novel idea of "form." If we can have a musical epic we should be able to have a plastic symphony. And after a fashion we do, in program music.

The proofreading of the dissertation is bad; it offends to read of "Tinck" and his "Zerlino." Attached to the work are twenty-seven *Kennzeichen der romantischen Form*. Of these *Wellendynamik*, as opposed to the ashlers of Classicism, leads the list, stands at the head. These are all put down as *Ergebnisse*. As applied to Brentano they are, but it is a young man's way of invoicing his convictions.

ALLEN W. PORTERFIELD

West Virginia University

The Publication of English Literature in Germany in the Eighteenth Century. By MARY BELL PRICE and LAWRENCE MARSDEN PRICE. University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Volume 17, 1934. Pp. viii + 288.

This volume adds a source-work of major importance to the shelf of studies in comparative literature. As the title does not indicate, it is in reality a bibliography of German translations, adaptations, and imitations of English poetry, drama, and fiction (including essay periodicals of the *Spectator* type) in the eighteenth century. In the twenty-one pages of introduction Professor Price interestingly reveals some of the problems and methods involved in the project. With characteristic modesty he submits the results as only tentative. Tentative they are in the sense that there are always more details to discover. New items will be turned up, but here

we have a clearing-house established for final facts in one of the most significant fields of literary study. The groundwork is laid for many potential studies which must precede the final statement of the full character and meaning of the shift from French to English influence in German letters.

It should be emphasized that the usefulness of this bibliography will not be confined solely to those interested in English-German literary relations. Workers in the strictly English field should find it valuable in several ways. Simply as a short-title list of English production it should take its place in the too much neglected field of eighteenth-century bibliography. Naturally it does not begin to give a complete accounting of English works, but in its 1166 items, few major writers are missing, while obscure and forgotten figures are numerous. But a more important fact is that we are provided with a selected list, representing the actual preferences of the reading and play-going public of the eighteenth century. Close study of the methods of the German publisher shows that he and his translator followed the changes of English taste with a shrewdness and accuracy which make their choice of works for translation a constant index of its temper and direction. The relative popularity of Shakespeare's plays, or of Shakespeare as compared with other dramatists, the response to Fielding as compared with the vogue of sentimental fiction in the work of such a writer as Charlotte Smith, who had fifteen novels translated—such aspects of literary taste are indicated for the English public as well as for the German.

What the German translator actually did with the English original has been only sporadically studied in previous scholarship; and the formidable labors involved in gathering the widely scattered materials for this book have prevented the authors from examining more than a small proportion of the actual works listed. "Many of them," Professor Price remarks, "are probably no longer in existence." This may be true of some of the shallows in the sea of fiction, but the writer can provide the assurance that he has himself located and examined much of the poetry and practically all the drama. However, existing collections, even in the great German repositories, are fragmentary.

The activities of the translator, as Professor Price emphasizes, varied from close translation to very liberal adaptation, or the mere use of the label 'aus dem Englischen' for its trade value. Freedom of adaptation should not, however, be regarded as unfortunate or due to mere carelessness. Much work was hasty, but Germany in the eighteenth century was not interested in English thought and letters for academic reasons. She admired the English for their freshness and natural vigor. Novels were translated to be read and plays to go directly on the stage. J. J. C. Bode, one of the most prolific and sound of the succession of over five hundred known translators, makes a pertinent comment in the preface to

his translation of Cumberland's *West Indian* (2nd ed., 1775). "Ich habe diese Comödie," he says, "aus dem Englischen verdeutscht. (Dass Wort wird Ihnen ja wol eben so lieb seyn, als wenn ich sagte, übersetzt. Es kann noch wol einmal die Zeit kommen, da Eins so viel heiszt als das Andre.)"

Any comment on the Prices' volume should call attention to its practicability. As a 'Nutzbau' it is spare of decorative comment. The indexing, by author and work, with both the English title and the German listed separately, makes it yield up its materials at once. The introduction contains suggestive analysis of the distribution of translations throughout the century, and points the way to a variety of investigations. To add here a few items in addition to the body of the work is only to suggest that further gleanings in this field will, except for further identifications, be limited. The numbers given correspond to the enumeration in the text.

(49) *Der Mensch wie er ist* is translated by Fr. H. Bothe. Letter to Nicolai Dec. 13, 1797 writes asking for advance of 50 Rthlr. "Der Roman Man as he is wird zwar nur 2 mässige Bände ausmachen. . . ."

(627) *Die Wildfänge* (The Libertines) is also translated by Bothe. Writes to Nicolai Nov. 20, 1800 "Ich habe die Ehre, Ew. Wohlgbhr. den Schluss *Der Wildfänge* zu übersenden. Ich müste mir mit diesem Roman viele Freiheit nehmen und besonders gegen das Ende hin manches ändern und vieles auslassen, denn das Original ward zu abenteurlich."

(844) Robinson, Mary. *Walsingham oder Das Naturkind* also translated for Nicolai by Bothe. Letter of August 25, 1798 "Ich schicke Ew. Wohlgeb. den Rest von *Walsingham*. Sie haben die 2 ersten Bände des Originals vermiszt? Ich schickte sie um die Mitte des July mit dem deutschen Text."

The remaining items are mainly in the field of the drama. Where an entirely new item is given two numbers are used to indicate its alphabetical position.

(95-96) Bickerstaff, Isaac. *Lionel and Clarissa*. 1768. *Lionel und Clarissa*. Lustspiel in 5 A n. d. E. Played in Hamburg Nov. or Dec. 1772 according to Meyer's Life of Schröder. Played in Berlin 18 April 1775 according to Plümcke, *Entwurf einer Theatergeschichte von Berlin*, Bln. 1781.

(130) Brooke, Frances. *History of Lady Julia Mandeville*. 1763. *Julie*, Trauerspiel von H. P. Sturz, 1767. M. Koch adds Frankfurt, Leipzig, Mannheim, bei Kaufmann, 1795.

(184) Cibber, Colley. *She would and she would not*. 1703. *Die Wankelmütige oder Der weibliche Betrüger*. Add edition 1783. Same. Mannheim Theaterbibliothek has MS. translation. No author given, 230 pp. *Sie meint's so böse nicht*. 1787. Add Hamburg, Herold, 1792.

(190) Cobb, James. *House to be sold*. 1802. *Hier ist eine Wohnung zu vermieten*, 1792. Could not be Cobb's *House to be sold*, which dates later. Perhaps is his *The First Floor* (1787).

(191) Weisze, C. F. *Komische Opern*. Add dates 1772, 1777. (Mannheim Theaterbibliothek catalog).

(234) Cowley, Hannah. *The Runaway*. 1776. *Amalia Schönewold*, Lustspiel in 5 A. nach der Runaway (MSS.). Listed in Reichard's Theater-Kalender für Deutschland, 1779, p. 116.

(245) Should be John Crowne.

(256) Cumberland, Richard. *The West Indian*. 1771. Kotzebue's version incorrectly given. Should be Leipzig, Kummer 1815, 1822. This is taken from a Munich edition not listed and to be described as follows. *Der Westindier*. Ein Lustspiel in 5 Aufz. a. d. Engl. übers. Joh. Nep. Fritz, München, 1775.

(340) Farquhar, George. *The Beaux Stratagem*. 1707. *Die Stutzerlist*. Leipzig Universitäts-Katalog lists a version 'übers. von Frankenburg,' n. d. There is also listed a *Beständige Ehepaar* (probably *Constant Couple*) n. d. The writer was unable to have these located. Probably manuscript versions.

(352) Fielding, Henry. *Amelia*. 1752. *Der Gasthof oder Trau, Schau*, 1769 by J. C. Brandes. *ADB.*, cxiv (1793), 102. Same in *Sämtliche dramatische Schriften* von Joh. Chr. Brandes. Leipzig, 1790-91. Bd. vi. "Die erste Idee dazu schöpfe der Verfasser aus dem Fieldingschen Roman *Amalia*."

(362) Fielding. *The Mock Doctor*. 1732. *Der Art zum Spass* should read *Der Arzt zum Spass*. Same. Add *Der grillenhafte Doctor* (Farce mit Gesang in 2. Akten von M. Reiberg. Die Handlung nach Heinrich Fielding). Lokal Schwank mit Gesang in 2. Die Grund-Idee nach Fieldings: Mock Doctor. Theatermanuskript. 68 Seiten. Katalog der Alten Bibliothek des Theaters an der Wien.

(435) Goldsmith, Oliver. *She Stoops to Conquer*. 1773. *Irrthum auf allen Ecken*. 1785 in K. K. National Hoftheater, Wien. Same as *Er hat sie alle zum Besten*. Add Augsburg, Stage, 1786.

(562) Fielding, Henry. *Jonathan Wild*. 1742. *Jonathan Wilde, der grosse, neu übers. von Hagemeister in Thaten und Feinheiten renommirter Kraft- und Kniffgenies*. This should be listed under number 357. Direct from Fielding's satirical novel. (Note: *Kniffgenien* should read *Kniffgenies*.)

(617) Lennox, Charlotte. *The Sister*. 1769. *Was seyn soll, schickt sich wohl*. Add Frankfurt, 1778.

(640) Locke's *Essay* mis-dated. Should read 1690.

(711) Murphy, Arthur. *All in the Wrong*. 1761. *Die Eifersüchtigen* exists in a MS. version in 3 acts, dated 1783 in Mannheim Theaterbibliothek. No translator indicated.

(712) Murphy, *The Old Maid*. 1761. *Die Übereilung* also in undated MS., Mannheim Theaterbibliothek.

(883-884) Savage, Richard. *Sir Thomas Overbury*. 1724. *Sir Thomas Overbury*, ein Trauerspiel verändert und für das königliche Theater in Covent Garden eingerichtet von Richard Savage, aus dem Englischen übersetzt von John Gerrard. Lüneburg, 1787. *ADB.*, lxxxiv, 1, 1788, p. 114.

(937 a) Liebrecht und Hörwald oder So geht's zuweilen auf dem Lande . . . München, 1782 is from *Measure for Measure*.

(1004) Thomas Southerne instead of Southern.

(1092) Vanbrugh's *Squire Trelooby* has been pushed back from 1703 to 1698 by Dr. Hotson.

(1120) Wallace, Eglantine. *The Ton rather than "Tone."*

(114) Whitehead, William. *School for Lovers*. 1762. J. Wihan is

authority for the statement that the Vienna edition of *Schule der Liebhaber*, 1776, has nothing to do with the English version. Bode's translation (1771) is the only one taken from Whitehead.

The volume takes its place in the series which has already established Professor Price as the authority in English-German literary studies.

ROBERT D. HORN

University of Oregon

Deutsche Volkslieder: Balladen, I, i. Edited by JOHN MEIER.

Berlin: De Gruyter, 1935. Pp. 196.

Balladen ("Deutsche Literatur," Das deutsche *Volkslied*," Bd. I).

Edited by JOHN MEIER. Leipzig: Reclam. Pp. 289, 1 plate.

The long-awaited collection of German folksongs intended to replace Erk and Böhme's *Deutscher Liederhort* has begun to appear. To be sure, the older work will not be entirely replaced, since the *Deutsche Volkslieder* will apparently include fewer songs. The *Liederhort* will remain the largest single collection of German songs. In the *Deutsche Volkslieder* the historical and critical introductions, the editions of the melodies and the texts are the result of amazing care in assembling and organizing materials of all sorts. Tunes and texts are brought for comparison from every corner of Europe. For example, K. Štrekelj's *Slovenske narodne pesme* (Laibach, 1895 ff.), an exhaustive and little-known collection of Slovene songs, is frequently drawn upon. Since the Slovenes borrowed German songs at a relatively early stage in the history of the texts, the Slovene versions are often important for comparison. Such standard collections of folksongs as Child, Doncieux, and Grundtvig are frequently referred to. A vast number of new broadsides have been unearthed, and the abundant manuscript versions preserved in the *Deutsches Volksliederarchiv* are freely used. Fortunately the edition is not burdened with variant readings and parallel texts. The songs are arranged according to the time when the Germans learned to know the subject-matter in question. They begin with *Das jüngere Hildebrandslied* and extend to *Der Abendgang*, a versification of the story of Pyramus and Thisbe made in the late Middle Ages. Since the songs in this first half-volume are the most difficult ones to annotate, the continuation will probably appear without great delay. Although only twenty songs are printed in the first half-volume, they represent a surprisingly wide range of types and problems. *Das jüngere Hildebrandslied* is a reworking of the old story and has no direct verbal connections with the Old High German epic lay. It has not survived to our day in oral tradition. *Ermenrichs Tod*, an echo of a Middle High

German epic tradition, has survived in Danish folksong. *Brautwerbung* and *Die Meererin* are modern Austrian folksongs preserving elements of Middle High German epics. *Der Jäger aus Griechenland* is a Middle High German epic fragment surviving in Low German and Dutch tradition. *Die Geburt im Walde* is a similar survival with parallels in English, French, and Danish balladry. These examples suffice to show that the problems discussed in the historical introductions vary widely and involve a familiarity with European folksongs of all kinds. Not one song offers the same problem as another. The discussion of the music represents a long step in advance of anything that has been done in this field, and later editors of folksong will find much to learn from it. In every way, the *Deutsche Volkslieder* is an ornament to German scholarship and a model to be emulated.

The second volume, *Balladen*, is an extensive anthology for the general reader. It includes 43 songs with brief introductions describing the origins, texts, and music. John Meier's preface (pp. 5-34) is a statement of present knowledge about ballad-origins. It should be compared with the preface to the edition in one volume of Child's *Ballads* by Professor Kittredge. John Meier discusses the echoes of German folksong in medieval Latin, the traces of folksong in Middle High German sources, and the penetration of folksong into the bourgeois culture of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. He describes clearly and effectively the style of folksongs and shows the nature of improvisation and the use of standing phrases. The choice of songs is excellent. We can only regret the lack of music. When the promised four volumes of this anthology are ready, we shall have an excellent survey of German traditional song.

ARCHER TAYLOR

The University of Chicago

Deutsche Mundartenforschung, ihre Wege, Ergebnisse und Aufgaben. Eine Einführung. Von ADOLF BACH. Heidelberg: Winter, 1934. Pp. xiv + 179.

The purpose of this treatise on the most recent type of German dialect investigation is to serve as an introduction to a subject difficult of approach by reason of the widely scattered material. The author for practical reasons confines himself in the main to the Rhenish dialects, which have been most thoroughly treated for his purposes and with which he is most familiar. Winteler in his *Kerenzer Mundart* (1876), p. 9 f., published the first truly scientific grammar of a dialect and almost contemporaneously G. Wenker (p. 15) conceived the idea of his great enterprise, the 'Sprachatlas'

of Germany. At the same time the Neo-Grammarians (p. 14) propounded their theory of the inviolability of the soundlaws. With all due respect for the great advance marked by the latter movement, any one familiar with dialect studies could not escape the conviction that dialects did not altogether support the same. Bach however does not deny the value of this theory as a working proposition (p. xii) but desires to emphasize the progress marked by the study of dialect geography as distinguished from the study of single dialects (p. xiii). He treats his subject under the captions: the historical problem, the phonetic problem, the geographical problem (Wenker's *Sprachatlas* and the interpretation of dialect charts) with a supplementary section entitled *Zur Erläuterung*, a commentary on the preceding paragraphs. The most striking innovation of modern dialect research is the emphasis placed on the importance of the territorial divisions developed since about the thirteenth century (p. 46), as distinguished from the tribal divisions of an earlier period, Franks, Thuringians, Alemans, Bavarians, which however are conceded as a possible factor in the dialect distinctions for an earlier period. The commentary above mentioned is of special interest. Here is treated the sound change *i*, *ü*, *iu* to *ei*, *au*, *eu* and its spread westward from Bavaria to the Rhine (p. 78 f.), likewise the lengthening of vowels in open syllable (p. 81), which probably spread in the opposite direction, from north to south. The theory of F. Wrede, the successor of Wenker, of extensive Ingvaenisms, even as far as Southern Germany, is mentioned, though certain aspects be hypothetic (p. 81 ff.). The great archbishoprics of Mainz, Trier, Köln and the territory subject to their influence are claimed to be regions of specific dialect character, the Mainz region being separated from Trier by the Hunsrück and the Trier region from Cologne by the Eifel (p. 85 ff.). Wrede and especially Professor Th. Frings receive credit for having done most to advance modern dialect research methods to a perfection rivalling successfully the excellent work of French scholars in their field. Toward the end of the book the author draws wider and wider circles, expanding even into the relation between his subject and general culture. To many these chapters will make a greater appeal than the more technical earlier parts. One problem remains unsolved as before: What are the causes of sound change? As long as this problem is not solved there will be loose threads and differences of opinion on linguistic problems. To finish his brief account the reviewer ventures the statement: The work under consideration could hardly have been better.

FREDERICK H. WILKENS

New York University

Johann von Konstanz. *Die Minnelehre*. Edited by FREDERIC ELMORE SWEET. Privately printed, Boston, Mass. (1934). Pp. lxxvii + 125.

This poem, formerly but now no longer, attributed to Heinzelin von Konstanz (Cf. Pfeiffer's edition, 1852, p. v) is reedited here. To the four texts known to Pfeiffer (A, Stuttgart; B, Donaueschingen; C, Heidelberg; D, Dresden) a fifth text E (Roudnici n. L., Lobkowiczky Archiv a Knihovna, VIFc. 26) is added. According to Sweet this text contains the most dependable and complete version of the poem (Cf. p. xl, lviii). The methods by which the editor obtains these results do not seem satisfactory to this reviewer. The treatment of the five manuscripts as to orthography and dialect (Introd., pp. xii-xlviii) is difficult to control as no specific references to authorities accompany statements. What is meant by the 'shortened infinitives' *gan*, *stan* (OHG *gän*, *stän*)? Is the editor mislead by NHG. *gehen*, *stehen*? Fuller variant readings than Pfeiffer has furnished are a distinct merit of the edition, and much labor bestowed on their collection deserves mention. But it does not seem to the reviewer that the best results can be obtained through the methods followed by the editor. All through the poem one has the feeling that the author's versification is reasonably close to that of the accepted standards of the MHG. classics and their immediate epigones, and that by correct reading of passages, with suggestions from the various texts, which should be available in photographic reproduction, it would be possible to obtain a fairly serviceable text. MS. A, the famous Weingartner Liederhandschrift, is already available in facsimile. The attribution of the poem to a certain Johannes von Konstanz (MS. D) is extremely doubtful, even if part of the passage should be authentic, as the rhymes *Kostenz*: *bestenz* seem to fall out of the regular cadence and *bestens* does not seem to be a possible form for a period reasonably close to the original or to reliable information about its history.

FREDERICK H. WILKENS

New York University

Frauen-Erleben und Frauen-Gestalten bei Heinrich von Kleist.
Von KURT SEMELA. Berlin: Brandel, 1934. Pp. 79.

The first half of this investigation presents Heinrich von Kleist's attitude toward women on the basis of the situations and experiences which prompted his letters to them. An analysis is made of Kleist's letters to his fiancée, Wilhelmine von Zenge, his step-sister Ulrike, his cousin by marriage, Marie von Kleist, Henriette Vogel, who died with him, and the one epistle to Karoline von Schlieben. The

author points out that Kleist, whose mother died when he was but a boy, was attracted by the motherly kindness and sympathy in women, by that loving comfort which had been denied him in his youth. Dr. Semela does not fall into the rather frequent error of regarding Kleist's early letters, in which a rationalistic outlook predominates, as definitive for his whole approach to life. It was the young man's inexperience which for a time prompted him to a one-sided worship of the life of reason. Because a relatively large number of letters date from this early period their significance for Kleist's views on life has been overrated.

The second and more important half of this dissertation deals with the major women characters in Kleist's works. With but few exceptions the author regards them as endowed with greater emotional depth than Kleist's male characters. Their more significant traits are summed up as "Reinheit, Zartheit und ein lebenstiefer Sinn, die Fähigkeit zur unbedingten Hingabe, die Entschlossenheit bis in den Tod, ihr 'Erstgefühl' zu wahren" (p. 76).

On the whole, this study is sound as far as it goes. The fundamental criticism to be made of it lies in its brevity. Kleist's strange relations with Henriette Vogel require a more extended treatment than is given here. Eve in *Der zerbrochene Krug* as well as Natalie in *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* deserves more adequate analysis, the former as an example of unselfish devotion, and the latter because of the significance of her rôle in the drama. A brief comparison is made of Penthesilea and Alkmene but not a word is said by way of explanation of Kleist's contrast of Penthesilea and Käthchen as found in his letter of December 8, 1808. The contrast between Käthchen and Kunigunde merits more careful discussion. On the other hand, the gentler feminine traits of Penthesilea's nature, which have been overlooked by various critics, are not neglected here.

Occasionally, Dr. Semela weakens his case by overstatement. Thus to pronounce Kleist "den grössten Frauendichter Deutschlands" (p. 79) is a dangerous bit of superlative. Other examples are "Kleist übersteigert stets" (p. 29), and "Kleist, der durchaus keine Fähigkeit zum Entschluss in sich trug, vielmehr durch die Not des Augenblicks getrieben wurde" (p. 28). One might well quarrel with the opinion that *Das Erdbeben in Chili* is one of the weakest of Kleist's *Novellen* (p. 53), for it has decided points of strength in structure, plot, characterization, motivation, diction and in the creation of suspense. Kleist's repeated attempt at formulating a plan for his life is attributed essentially to a serious sense of responsibility (p. 38), whereas a further and perhaps weightier reason lies in his fear of facing life without a plan.

Dr. Semela is well read in the critical literature on Kleist, his conclusions are, in the main, based on logical analysis, and he does not hesitate to differ with older critics. He is to be commended

for writing a study free from the sensationalism and innuendo to be found in various treatises on his subject, and for taking to task those writers whose morbid fancy flirts with thoughts of sadism in the discussion of *Penthesilea*. Moreover, he has the good judgment to refrain from strained metaphysical interpretations, a common enough failing in studies on Kleist. In these days of turgid, rhetorical writing, the unaffected straightforwardness of his style is worthy of comment.

JOHN C. BLANKENAGEL

Wesleyan University

Friedrich Hebbel. A Study of His Life and Work by EDNA PURDIE. [New York and] London: Oxford University Press, 1932. Pp. 276. \$4.00.

Der ausgesprochene Zweck dieser Hebbelstudie ist, Hebbel als Mensch und Dichter einem weiteren englischen Publikum näherzubringen. Diesen Zweck sucht die Verfasserin in konservativer Weise zu erreichen, indem sie eine recht eingehende Lebensbeschreibung mit einer Analyse der einzelnen Werke verwebt. Dieses Schema wird nur am Schluß des Buches unterbrochen, wo ein Kapitel der *Conception of Tragedy* gewidmet ist. Die Analyse der Dramen behandelt in ebenfalls traditioneller Form das Verhältnis zur Quelle, die Entstehungsstadien, den Aufbau und die Motivierung des Dramas, woran sich eine kurze ästhetische Wertung anschließt. Diese Art der Darstellung ist durchaus unter dem angegebenen Zweck zu beurteilen; sie kann nur ein erstes Heranführen an den Dichter zu sein beanspruchen. Aber auch dann und gerade dann hätte sich eine dynamischere Darbietung des Materials empfohlen. Das Biographische verliert sich manchmal zu sehr im Detail und wird anekdotisch anstatt die Wesenszüge des Dichters und seiner inneren Entwicklung herauszuarbeiten. Infolgedessen erscheinen auch die Werke mehr als Episoden und gewollte Kunstprodukte denn als notwendiger Ausdruck einer Lebenssituation und ihrer komplizierten Problematik. Das Gesamtwerk kommt in seinem organischen Wachstum überhaupt nicht zur Geltung. Noch abstrakter werden die theoretischen Äußerungen Hebbels behandelt. Es geht natürlich nicht an, das Werk eines Dichters aus seinen theoretischen Bemerkungen zu erklären; das führt manchmal zu völliger Mißinterpretation. Ebensowenig aber läßt sich die Theorie beiseite schieben. Sie ist, soweit sie original ist—and das ist sie bei Hebbel—ebenso sehr Ausdruck der persönlichen Problematik wie das Werk selbst; der Unterschied ist nur der von logischer und anschaulicher Gestaltung. Zum vollen Verständnis des Hebbelschen Werkes gehört dazu noch seine Stellung in der geistigen Entwicklung des 19. Jahrhunderts, d. h. sein Versuch, das idealis-

tische Weltbild zu retten durch eine Verbindung mit der vitalistisch-existentiellen Auffassung, wie sie sich bei Schopenhauer und Grillparzer ausgebildet hatte. Die Verbindung von persönlicher und zeitlicher Problematik hat Hebbel selbst als wesentlich für die Dichtung empfunden, so in der Widmung zu *Maria Magdalene*, in der er erklärt, wie sich "das innere Labyrinth" und das "Äußere der Welt" in der poetischen Darstellung ergänzend und erhellend verschränken.

F. W. KAUFMAN

Smith College

Der große Duden. Bearbeitet von Dr. OTTO BASLER. Band I: Rechtschreibung der deutschen Sprache und der Fremdwörter. Elfte, neubearbeitete und erweiterte Auflage. 61 + 670 S. RM. 4. Band II: Stilwörterbuch der deutschen Sprache. 16 + 694 S. RM. 4. Band IV: Bildwörterbuch der deutschen Sprache. 11 + 795 S. RM. 4. Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut, 1934 und 1935.

Der Sprachbrockhaus, deutsches Bildwörterbuch für jedermann. iv + 763 S. RM. 5. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1935.

The two publications fill a long-felt need and are in a way different enough to complement each other. The once slender Duden is now presented to us in four volumes. The first volume contains the well known spelling dictionary of the German language considerably expanded, adding 100 pages. The very first page under A, for instance, is increased to the extent of one of the four columns, inserting A—*Ampere*; A—coinage sign Berlin; A—Roman number 5000; A—Alpha; A.A.—*Auswärtiges Amt*; the explanation for the verb *Aalen*; the Danish name of a Schleswig city *Aabenraa*; and the compound *Aronsstab*. The excellent theoretical introductions on the principles of spelling, German grammar, word formation, punctuation, typography, and proofreading, very valuable especially for the foreigner, have been revised and present their material in the shortest possible form. The careful reader will be grateful for hints on etymology and derivation in the dictionary.

The second volume is entirely new. In dictionary form it furnishes a wealth of material concerning usage of words, phraseology, and idiomatic expression. Under the heading of *putzen*, for instance, we not only find the objects which may be wiped or shined, but also such conversational expressions as *Klingeln putzen*—go peddling or begging; *geputzt wie ein Pfingstochse*—all dolled up; *jen. die Nase putzen*—to scold somebody. The sublime is often

separated from the burlesque only through a comma, and the person with a sense of humor may enjoy next to a Bible quotation such pearls of Wilhelm Busch as *Selbst im dicksten Publikum, schwebt dein Geist um mich herum*. Under the heading *zwischen*, e. g., we find quotations from Goethe, Kind, Schiller, Rilke, Ludwig, and Hoffmann von Fallersleben.

A serious, yet amusing introduction by Professor E. Geißler gives pithy and sensible advice concerning organic expression, foreign words, clarity, simplicity, and good taste in style.

The third volume, containing a German grammar and less interesting to the foreign student, is not reviewed here; the principal feature of the fourth volume, the *Bilderduden*, is the illustration. It presents in its 348 tables about 30,000 objects, listed for quick reference in the index under 21,000 items. In some instances colored plates might have been desirable (for mushrooms, for example), in others, overcrowding blurs the picture or simplified drawings are insufficient for characterization (for conifers, for instance). But all in all, the material will prove invaluable for the acquiring of a vocabulary and as a basis for conversation in oral pictures.

The *Sprachbrockhaus* aims to give, in the manner of the *Petit Larousse*, a complete German vocabulary, to characterize words according to age and usage (literary, scientific, idiomatic, etc.), and to illustrate their specific and idiomatic meaning in phrases. The careful indication of declension and conjugation makes this book especially useful for foreigners and the profuse but judiciously chosen illustrations assemble in their readable legends a wealth of information concerning technical terms in a small space.

ERNST FEISE

BRIEF MENTION

Hugo von Hofmannsthal, I. Die Gestalten. Von GRETE SCHÄDER. Berlin: Junker und Dünnhaupt, 1933 (= Neue Forschung Heft 21, 1). Pp. 197. Mk. 8. Die Beurteilung dieser Arbeit über Hofmannsthal wird einigermaßen erschwert dadurch, daß die Studie *Hugo von Hofmannsthal II, Bildungswelt und dichterische Welt von Hans H. Schäder* noch nicht vorliegt. Von jeder literargeschichtlichen Einordnung ist daher vorläufig abgesehen worden und es ist deshalb nicht immer ganz leicht, den Entwicklungsgang zu verfolgen, weil die Beziehung zu Zeitgenossen und Strömungen grundsätzlich ausgeschieden werden, wodurch z. B. Hofmannsthal viel einseitiger romantisch erscheint und mit dem Impressionismus kaum noch Gemeinsamkeiten aufweist. Andrerseits entsteht auf

diese Weise ein Bild von einer Geschlossenheit, wie es bei kaum einem andern Dichter denkbar erscheint, Hofmannsthal indessen in sofern gerecht wird, als der Kreis seiner Entfaltung (Entwicklung wäre es kaum zu nennen) sich mit seinen letzten Werken schließt; was immer in Fülle und Reife schon in den ersten Werken vorgebildet ist, kehrt in Vertiefung und wechselnder Wertung bis zum *Großen Welttheater* und zum *Turm* wieder. Besonders ist es die Gestalt des Toren, die ich selbst in einer von der Verfasserin nicht angeführten Arbeit als typisch für den Dichter untersucht habe, und die auf Grund des mir damals nicht zugänglichen Materials (Hofmannsthals *Ad Me ipsum*, veröffentlicht 1930) fester in des Dichters Praeexistenzidee verankert werden konnte.

Mit klarer Periodisierung, steter Beziehung von dichterischen und theoretischen Werken Hofmannsthals aufeinander, Herausarbeitung der Grundzüge seines Schaffens und zart, doch sicher einführender Charakterisierung seiner Werke und Gestalten erhellt die Verfasserin die nicht immer leicht zu ergründenden Symbole und Probleme und weist die erstaunliche Einheit des ganzen Werkes nach, sodaß am Schluß die Welt des Dichters, schwermutvoll, leicht erdenfern, aber voll Seelenschöne und Liebenswertheit vor uns steht, gütiger und freundlicher als die Stefan Georges und in ihrem Eigenwert kaum seiner Billigung bedürftig. Mit der angekündigten Studie über den Wurzelgrund des Werkes dürfte vorläufig Abschließendes über Hofmannsthal gesagt worden sein.

ERNST FEISE

Expressionismus und Aktivismus, eine typologische Studie. Von WOLFGANG PAULSEN. Bern: Gotthelf Verlag, 1935. Pp. 244. Paulsen's Studie, unter Fritz Strich's Führung entstanden, unternimmt es, die Strömungen Expressionismus und Aktivismus als gegensätzlich zu erweisen und zu charakterisieren; sie leistet ihre wichtige Aufgabe mit Scharfsicht und gelangt zu dem Resultat einer glücklichen Klärung beider, sie ordnet sie in den Gang der Literaturrentwicklung ein und wirft dabei erhellende Lichter auf frühere Epochen, hilft die Begriffe Irrationalismus, Rationalismus und den gesamten angrenzenden Problemkreis in Beziehung zu setzen und die Bedeutung der Strichschen Typologie von neuem darzutun.

Das erste Kapitel, mit einer Überschau der Vorläufer einsetzend, zeigt die Gemeinsamkeit des Kampfes in Bewegung und Chaos gegen den maschinellen Alltag der Beschwichtigung und Entzagung. Die Welt soll überwunden (Expressionismus), soll umgeschaffen (Aktivismus) werden. Im zweiten wird Expressionismus als gotische Lebensform erwiesen, sein Verhältnis zu Gotik, Barock, Romantik mit Anknüpfung an Worringer klargestellt. Aktivismus dagegen (drittes Kapitel) hat mit Aufklärung gemein die bewußte

Gestaltung des Chaos vom Geist aus, im Gegensatz zur Ekstase mit dem Ziel Gott, Paradies und Sehnsucht. Er kämpft indessen gegen zwei Fronten, gegen den unbedingten Irrationalismus einerseits und einen ebenso unbedingten Rationalismus andererseits, der die Grenzen seiner Zuständigkeit überschreitet; denn er ist nicht gegründet auf eine Überschätzung der Wissenschaft, sondern auf den willenshaften Glauben an die Kraft des Menschen. Doch ist das Ziel stärker als beim Expressionismus durch Negation bestimmt. Die Schwierigkeit der Abgrenzung der beiden parallelen Bewegungen, durch Gleichheit des Tempos und äußerliche Ähnlichkeit der Ausdrucksformen bestimmt, kompliziert sich durch Anlehnung an gleiche Vorbilder und Vorläufer, Plato, Nietzsche, Tolstoj, Dostojewski, die hingegen entsprechend mit durchgehender Verschiedenheit ausgewertet werden. In der Herausarbeitung dieser Auswertung zeigen sich die Vorzüge der Paulsenschen Arbeit im hellsten Lichte.

Kapitel IV mit der Darlegung der "Beziehungen beider Bewegungen" und Kapitel V mit der Anwendung auf Lyrik, Drama und Roman ziehen das Fazit der Leistung auf Grundlage der vorhergehenden prinzipiellen Erwägungen. Ausführliche Anmerkungen, Literaturangaben und Index schließen diese Arbeit, die sich in ihrer durchgängigen Sachlichkeit freihält von überschwänglicher Abstraktion und bedeutungsloser Stoffanhäufung und die unsere Kenntnis kürzlich abgeschlossener Bewegungen entscheidend bereichert.

ERNST FEISE

Der Tod Adalbert Stifters. Von Dr. ANDREAS MARKUS. Berlin: Verlag Emil Ebering, 1934. Das Problem Dichter und Persönlichkeit wird wohl immer unlösbar sein. Ist es möglich, dass der Dichter so von seinem Beruf erfüllt ist, dass er nur Werkzeug ist und seine Persönlichkeit darunter leidet? Oder gibt es einen ständigen Kampf zwischen den Forderungen des Dichterberufs und den Ansprüchen der Persönlichkeit, der sich so steigern kann, das nur ein tragisches Ende möglich ist?

Seit dem Erscheinen von Heins Stifterbiographie musste der Literarhistoriker sich mit dem Gedanken abfinden, dass Adalbert Stifter den Tod durch eigene Hand gefunden hat. Trotzdem blieben über dem Wie und Warum dieses tragischen Endes noch so manche dunkle Zweifel hängen, die zu lichten das vorliegende Werk sich zur Aufgabe macht. An Hand von Berichten der Zeitgenossen und dem jetzt zugänglichen ärztlichen Befund weist der Verfasser einwandfrei nach, dass Stifter seinen Tod beschleunigte, indem er selbst Hand an sich legte.

Der ständige Kampf zwischen Brotberuf und Dichterberuf,

unglückliche häusliche Verhältnisse, seelische Depressionszustände verbunden mit schweren körperlichen Leiden machten seine letzten Tage zur Qual, so dass er nach dem Rasiermesser griff. Doppelt tragisch ist diese Tat, da der Dichter den Freitod durchaus ablehnte und er überdies nach Aussage seines Arztes seinem Leiden ohnedies bald erlegen wäre.

Für den Verehrer Stifters ist das Bild des Dichters durch vorliegende gründliche und sachliche Arbeit nicht getrübt, sondern geklärt worden. Dem Verfasser wissen wir dafür Dank.

LYDIA ROESCH

West Virginia University

The Wedding of Sir Gawain and Dame Ragnell. By GEORGE BRANDON SAUL. Translated from the Middle English with an Introduction. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1934. Pp. xiv + 30. \$0.50. Publisher and author are to be congratulated upon this little book. It is attractively bound and clearly printed on good paper. Dr. Saul's introduction gives nearly all that an undergraduate or general reader would wish to know of scholarly opinion about the original poem, and his prose does not clog the movement of a story whose verse, if at times irregular, is always rapid.

A few comments and corrections follow, in which M. stands for the first printing of the poem in Madden's *Syr Gawayne*, and S. for Miss Laura Sumner's ed. of 1924. Line numbers and quotations are from the book last named.

48 S. *after the grasse he taste*, "he assayed the grease," see *Gaw. and Gr.* Knt. 1325-29, 1378. 96 S. *Nowther frende ne freynd*. Adopt M.'s *fremde ne freynd*, "neither unsib nor kin." 221 S. *spyrring* may well be "asking questions, making inquiries," see *NED. speer*, v.¹ 237 S. *lute*, see *NED. lout*, sb.² obsol., "an inclination, bend," and cf. *ON. lútr*, "a stooping." 440 S. *a greatt shake*, see *NED. shake*, sb.¹, I, 1 a, "quickly, with headlong speed." 489 S. *bete and bynde*, "thresh and bind wheat, i. e., perform servile labour?" 550 S. *handfulle* is *handful*, "four inches," see *NED. s. v. 3* obsol. 615 S. *praty*, "clever, skilful," see *NED. pretty*, adj. I, II, 2a?

HENRY L. SAVAGE

Princeton University